THE OCCASION AND PURPOSE FOR THE FINAL DRAFTING OF ACTS

by

Ronald Eastwood Cottle

A Dissertation Presented to the
FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
(Religion)

June 1967

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
UNIVERSITY PARK
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90007

This dissertation, written by

RONALD EASTWOOD COTTLE

under the direction of his Dissertation Committee, and approved by all its members, has been presented to and accepted by the Graduate School, in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Milton C. Kloetzel
Dean

Date June 8, 1967

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

Chairman

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge with gratitude the chairman of my committee. Professor Eldon J. Epp has not only given me wise counsel, but warm encouragement as well. His has been an open door of sincere friendship as well as one of sound scholarship. I owe him much.

Also I wish to acknowledge my wife, Joanne, for the many years of patience and encouragement which this paper represents. Hers has been the more difficult task. She has been steadfast and helpful.

There are others who have made significant contributions toward my education to whom I feel a debt of gratitude. Some of these at the University of Southern California are Professor Gene M. Tucker, Professor Robert P. Scharlemann, Professor Thomas W. Africa, and Professor John E. Cantelon.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		ii
	PART I. INTRODUCTION	
Chapter		
I.	SURVEY OF SCHOLARSHIP ON "THE PURPOSE OF ACTS"	2
	PART II. THE OCCASION FOR THE FINAL DRAFTING OF ACTS	
I.	INTRODUCTION: A BRIEF SURVEY OF IMPORTANT LITERATURE	10
II.	WEAKNESSES IN THE EVIDENCE OF THE PREFACES FOR PRIORITY OF LUKE OVER ACTS	14
III.	ARGUMENTS FOR THE PRIORITY OF ACTS OVER LUKE	20
	PART III. THE PURPOSE FOR THE FINAL DRAFTING OF ACTS	
I.	INTRODUCTION	33
II.	PETER-PAUL PARALLELS--IN DEFENSE OF PAUL'S APOSTLESHIP	39
III.	HELLENISTS-PAUL PARALLELS--IN DEFENSE OF PAUL'S GENTILE MINISTRY	55
IV.	JESUS-PAUL PARALLELS--IN DEFENSE OF PAUL THE PRISONER	65
	PART IV. CONCLUSION	
CONCLUSION		101
BIBLIOGRAPHY		104

PART I

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

SURVEY OF SCHOLARSHIP ON "THE PURPOSE OF ACTS"[1]

The purpose of Acts has been called "the elusive mystery of present-day New Testament scholarship."[2] Indeed there appears to be no real consensus of scholarly opinion regarding the occasion and purpose of Acts. This introduction is intended to demonstrate the chaotic state of research into this "storm-center" of current New Testament study. An effort has been made to give only a general classification of the positions of the various scholars without discussion of the various shadings and minor points of view.

A. Historical

McGiffert[3] takes a rather exclusive and positive

---

[1]Further study regarding such a survey may be gained from Goguel, Intr. III, 37ff.; A. C. McGiffert and J. W. Hunkin, B. C. I, 2, 363ff.; Haenchen, Apg., Meyer III (ed. 13), 13ff.; and Feine-Behm-Kümmel, Intr. to N. T., 112ff.

[2]A. C. Winn, "Elusive Mystery: The Purpose of Acts," Interpretation, 13, (1959), 144-56.

[3]A. C. McGiffert, B. C., I, p. 363.

position that the purpose of the book is "wholly historical." Chase says that "The history of an epoch of revelation" is contained in Acts.[4] It is Rackham's position that Acts contains "accurate history for posterity"[5] and that such was its purpose. McNeile is of the same opinion, basing his argument on Luke 1:1-4.[6]

However, E. F. Scott, in writing about the Gospel of Mark, said:

> No history worth reading has ever been written without some object, other than the mere narration of facts. The writer is in sympathy with a country or a cause or a form of government, and wishes to magnify or defend it.[7]

That Acts is a history of the progress of the Gospel from Jerusalem to Rome is the position claimed by many reputable scholars. Some of these are Moffatt,[8] Foakes-Jackson and Lake,[9] Howson,[10] and others.

---

[4]F. H. Chase, The Credibility of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, p. 29.

[5]R. B. Rackham, The Acts of the Apostles, p. xxxvii.

[6]A. H. McNeile, An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament, p. 74f.

[7]E. F. Scott, The Literature of the New Testament, p. 63f.

[8]James Moffatt, An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, p. 284.

[9]F. H. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake, B. C., II, p. 175.

[10]J. S. Howson, Evidential Value of the Acts of the Apostles, p. 133.

B. Religious or Didactic

Foakes-Jackson and Lake[11] think that "the didactic purpose of the editor of Acts is clearer than his apologetic object." This was also the position of B. Weiss.[12] Van Manen, in an article in Biblica says that Acts was written to "instruct Theophilus concerning the old Christian past."[13]

C. Irenic

Bauer and the Tübingen school held that the Acts was written in the second century for the purpose of reconciling Petrine and Pauline Christianity. Gloag says of Bauer, "He maintains a conciliatory rather than an apologetic design."[14]

D. Apologetic

The large majority of the answers which have been given to the question of Luke's purpose in writing Acts may, for the most part, be grouped under the heading of Apologetics. As D. W. Riddle says:

It has been recognized by many that it has an obvious

---

[11] F. H. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake, B. C. II, p. 187. Cf. also Vol. V, p. 212, "A narrative of events told . . . to create belief."

[12] B. Weiss, A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament, p. 320f.

[13] W. Van Manen, "Paul," Encyclopedia Biblica, Vol. III, p. 3624.

[14] P. Gloag, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, Vol. I, p. 27.

> apologetic motive, although few had detected this interest in the Gospel. But there is notorious disagreement concerning the point to which this apologetic was directed.[15]

Some of the categories within this general heading are as follows:

(1) Political

Moffatt[16] takes this as a secondary purpose. Findlay[17] thinks that that Luke wrote "to convince the government of the Roman Empire that it had nothing to fear from the new religion." Lake is quoted by Cadbury[18] as reversing the order by holding that "he wishes to show that the Roman authorities were not hostile to Christianity," but in an article in The Dictionary of the Apostolic Church,[19] Lake says:

> One purpose was the desire to protest against the view that Christians had always been, or could ever be, regarded as a danger to the Empire.

Others who think that Acts is primarily an apologetic of Christianity against the charge of hostility to the State

---

[15]D. W. Riddle, "The Occasion of Luke-Acts," JRel, (1930), 54.

[16]James Moffatt, An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, p. 303f.

[17]J. A. Findlay, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 3.

[18]H. J. Cadbury, B. C., V, p. 329.

[19]K. Lake, Dictionary of the Apostolic Church, Vol. 1, p. 21f.

include: J. Dupont,[20] C. T. Craig,[21] W. C. van Unnik,[22] J. C. O'Neill,[23] E. Haenchen.[24]

(2) Apology for Paul

Still says that "the whole story is seen to be planned . . . for one definite end--a defense document for Paul's trial at Rome."[25] Likewise, William Ramsay thinks that Acts is an apology for Paul, but he also thinks that the honor of the Gospel itself is being defended at the same time.[26]

(3) Multiple purpose

Other scholars are more difficult to categorize regarding their opinion of the purpose of Acts. We might list them under the heading of multiple purpose. F. F. Bruce sees in Acts the history of "The Acts of the Holy Spirit," a defense of Paul and Christianity against the accusation of various opponents, and the spread of the

---

[20]J. Dupont, "Le Salut des Gentile et la Signification Théologique du Livres des Actes," NTS, 6 (1959-60), 133.

[21]C. T. Craig, B. C., V, p. 321.

[22]W. C. van Unnik, "The 'Book of Acts,' the Confirmation of the Gospel," NovTest, IV (1960), 40f.

[23]J. C. O'Neill, The Theology of Acts, p. 171f.

[24]E. Haenchen, Apg., (Meyer III, ed. 13), pp. 513, 552, 620.

[25]J. I. Still, St. Paul on Trial, p. 11.

[26]W. M. Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, p. 14.

Gospel from Jerusalem to Rome.[27]

(4) Proclamation of the Gospel with Christian Readers in View

Feine-Behm-Kümmel[28] argue that Acts tells about the age of the apostles in order to edify the Christians of Luke's day (which is considerably later--near the turn of the century, 85-95 A. D.) and to win the Gentiles. In support of this position they list other well-known scholars. Wikenhauser: victorious course of the Gospel to the capitol of the Empire; Stagg: breakthrough of religious, racial, and national limitations to the individual preaching of the Gospel; Trocmé and Eltester: the entire work of Luke-Acts is Gospel (that is, proclamation for current results, and not history of former proclamation); Ehrhardt: Acts is the Gospel of the Holy Spirit; O'Neill: the chief object of Acts is preaching the Gospel for unbelievers today; van Unnik: Acts is a testimony for God's own saving activity in relation to the world today.

As we can see from the above, there has been and still is much disagreement about what is the actual purpose of Acts. Indeed one could question whether an unequivocal answer to the question is even possible at this stage. In

---

[27]F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, pp. 29-34.

[28]W. G. Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, p. 115.

fact, van Unnik has called this question a "storm-center in contemporary scholarship"[29] and has challenged new hands to toil in this vast and interesting field of research.[30] This study is an attempt, though a limited one, to respond to the challenge.

---

[29]W. C. van Unnik, "Luke-Acts, a Storm Center in Contemporary Scholarship," Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 15-32.

[30]Ibid., p. 29.

PART II

THE OCCASION FOR THE FINAL DRAFTING OF ACTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION--A BRIEF SURVEY OF IMPORTANT LITERATURE

Someone said that "New Testament scholars have almost universally assumed that Luke was written before Acts."[1] Indeed, the results of the easy reliance on such an assumption can be seen in the way some scholars have gone about dating Luke-Acts. Godet, impressed by an early date for Acts, did not even stop to consider the possibility that Acts might have preceded Luke in time. He said, "The book, Acts, certainly written after the gospel, does not seem to have been composed after the destruction of Jerusalem."[2] On the other hand, Moffatt, arguing from a late date for Luke to a still later one for Acts says "As Acts is a sequel to the third gospel, and as the latter was written after 70 A. D., the terminus a quo for the composition of the δεύτερος λόγος is determined without

---

[1]H. G. Russell, "Which Was Written First, Luke or Acts?" HTR, 48 (1955), p. 167.

[2]E. Godet, A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke, p. 544.

further ado."[3] In both cases there is first the underlying assumption of the priority of the gospel, and then there is the use of evidence in one book to assign a date to the other.

However, there have been a few scholars who have dared to suggest that Acts might have been written prior to the gospel.[4] In 1905 Bishop F. H. Chase indicated the possibility that the author first wrote only the story of Paul's apostleship, and that he enlarged it twice after that: first, to include the story of the other apostles, and then to include in a second volume the story of Jesus.[5] In 1948 C. S. C. Williams, following C. H. Dodd's argument that Luke's account of Jesus' prediction of the fall of Jerusalen (Ch. 21) is not a vaticinium ex eventu, but employs prophetic language which would be common to any

---

[3]J. Moffatt, An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, p. 311.

[4]Earlier than those discussed here there were the articles by Ulrich Melchior, "Kommt Lukas wirklich in die Apostelgeschichte vor?" TSK, 10 (1837), 369-77, and "Lukas kommt nicht in der Apostelgeschichte vor." TSK, 13 (1840), 1003-19; and those of C. Krauss, "Kommt Lukas wirklich in der Apostelgeschichte vor?" Studien der Evangelischen Geistlichkeit Würtembergs, 10 (1838, Heft 2), 122-47, and "Ob Lukas der Verfasser der Apostelgeschichte seyn konne? Antwort auf die Replik des Herrn Prof. Ulrich," Studien der Evangelischen Geistlichkeit Würtembergs, 13 (1842, Heft 2), 106-40.

[5]F. H. Chase, "The Gospels in the Light of Historical Criticism," Cambridge Theological Essays, pp. 380-81.

diligent reader of the LXX,[6] suggested that "Acts may have been written after a compilation of Q and L material and before the third gospel as we have it."[7] Still more recently, Roland Koh also suggested that Acts was composed before Luke,[8] and he, like Williams, based his suggestion on the Proto-Luke theory of B. H. Streeter[9] and V. Taylor.[10] Koh suggested that the "former treatise" mentioned in Acts 1:1 refers not to our present Luke but to Proto-Luke, that this Proto-Luke was composed in 58-60, and that it was followed by Acts in 63 and by our present Luke in

---

[6]C. H. Dodd, "The Fall of Jerusalem and the 'Abomination of Desolation,'" Journal of Roman Studies, 37 (1947), pp. 46-54, esp. p. 52, "The Conception of the coming disaster which the author has in mind is a generalized picture of the fall of Jerusalen as imaginatively presented by the prophets. So far as any historical event has colored the picture, it is not Titus' capture of Jerusalem in A. D. 70, but Nebuchadnezzar's capture in 586 B. C." (We shall have occasion to refer to this argument later.) See also A. Harnack, The Date of Acts and the Synoptic Gospels, p. 124, and R. B. Rackham, The Acts of the Apostles, p. liv.

[7]C. S. C. Williams' Review of The Acts of the Apostles by W. L. Knox, in JTS (1948), 204. See also Williams' revision of A. H. McNeile's An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament, pp. 34, 41. Finally, see Williams, "The Date of Luke-Acts," ET 64, (1952-53) 283. F. F. Bruce adopts this same position in The Acts of the Apostles, p. 25.

[8]Roland Koh, The Writings of St. Luke, pp. 31-34.

[9]B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels, pp. 201-22. See n. 19 below.

[10]V. Taylor, "The Lukan Authorship of the Third Gospel and the Acts," The Expositor, Series 9, vol. 4 (1925), 282-91.

71-75.[11]

Two other noteworthy articles have followed these. In 1955 H. G. Russell wrote "Which Was Written First, Luke or Acts,"[12] in which he outlined five possible arguments for the priority of Acts over Luke. Perhaps because Russell did not really seem to be convinced of his own arguments,[13] his work has gone largely unnoticed. However, a brief article in the March, 1965, issue of JBL by Pierson Parker is more bold in its conclusions. Professor Parker argues, largely from Act's failure to mention many important events which occurred between 64 and 70 A. D., that "It must of necessity have been written not a moment after A. D. 63."[14]

---

[11]Roland Koh, The Writings of St. Luke, pp. 31-34.

[12]H. G. Russell, "Which Was Written First, Luke or Acts," HTR, 48 (1955), 167-74.

[13]Ibid., p. 168, "Now to suggest this possibility is not necessarily to urge its probability. Perhaps we simply do not have the evidence on which to base a firm judgment either way." See also p. 174, "My intention in discussing the possibility of Acts' priority to Luke has not been to try to prove its probability. . . ."

[14]Pierson Parker, "The 'Former Treatise' and the Date of Acts," JBL, 84 (1965), p. 53.

CHAPTER II

WEAKNESSES IN THE EVIDENCE OF THE PREFACES FOR PRIORITY OF LUKE OVER ACTS

The clearest evidence for the priority of Luke has been Acts 1:1f., where the author speaks of a "former treatise," πρῶτον λόγον, which he has written.

> The former [lit., first, πρῶτον] treatise I made, O Theophilus, concerning all that Jesus began both to do and to teach, until the day in which he was received up, after that he had given commandment through the Holy Spirit unto the apostles whom he had chosen.

To this might be added Luke 1:1-4 where the author is almost certainly giving us a preface not only to the Gospel but to Acts as well.[1] However, as Cadbury has indicated, Luke 1:1-4 may have been written after Acts had already been completed, so that this general preface does not really produce any substantial evidence for the priority of Luke. Furthermore, in spite of the fact that Acts 1:1 seems certain of the priority of Luke, most prefaces then, as now, were probably written after the work was

---

[1] H. J. Cadbury, Beginnings, Vol. II, pp. 136, 492. See also articles by Cadbury in The Expositor, June, 1921, p. 439, and Dec., 1922, pp. 414, 418.

completed.[2] Therefore, while the prefaces indicate that Luke and Acts are two parts of one larger work, they do not offer any clear proof as to which part was written first.[3]

Indeed, Parker is certainly correct when he reasons that since ancient Greek authors, like modern English ones, sometimes wrote casually of the "first" of two things (sometimes using πρῶτον and other times using πρότερος), it is not necessary to conclude that the writing of the Third Gospel precedes Acts in time. In fact, it is presumptuous to do so.[4]

Furthermore, if we look carefully at the way Luke describes the contents of the πρῶτον λόγον in Acts 1:1-2, and then compare that description with Proto-Luke as the latter is generally known, we will see that it is actually Proto-Luke and not the Third Gospel to which Acts 1:1-2 refers. That is, the πρῶτον λόγον is Proto-Luke, not the Third Gospel as we now have it.

Before carrying the argument further, we should remind ourselves of the Proto-Lukan theory and also of the

---

[2]K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury, Beginnings, Vol. V, p. 350.

[3]See H. G. Russell, "Which Was Written First, Luke or Acts," p. 167.

[4]Pierson Parker, "The 'Former Treatise,'" 52. The use of πρῶτον (one of more than two) as over against πρότερος (one of two) is not significant since Luke nowhere uses the latter form. Cf. D. Plooij, "The Work of St. Luke," The Expositor, 80 (1914), 513.

suggested contents of Proto-Luke. B. H. Streeter first proposed the "Proto-Luke" theory in 1921 in The Hibbert Journal.[5] The theory was enlarged and elaborated in chapter seven of his book, The Four Gospels.[6] Vincent Taylor fully espoused the theory in his works.[7] Streeter argued that Luke actually wrote not two, but three documents about the history of early Christianity. Proto-Luke is a single document consisting of material derived from Q and L composed by Luke before and independent of Mark's Gospel. Several years later, after the Gospel of Mark had appeared, Luke took over this Gospel, fusing into its basic framework his own earlier Proto-Luke to form the Third Gospel as we now have it. Luke borrowed about 50 percent of Mark's content as well as his general outline. He then prefixed the birth narratives of John the Baptist and Jesus to form the final document. It remained only for him to compose the beautifully written introduction (1:1-4) and he had the Third Gospel as we now know it.

The passages commonly assigned to Proto-Luke are 3:1-4:30; 5:1-11; 6:12-8:3; 9:51-18:14; 19:1-28, 37-44, 47-8; 22:14-24:53, minus the brief Markan insertions in

---

[5]B. H. Streeter, "Fresh Light on the Synoptic Problem," The Hibbert Journal, 20 (Oct., 1921), 103-12.

[6]B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels, pp. 155-200.

[7]V. Taylor, Behind the Third Gospel, and also Formation of the Gospel Tradition, pp. 191-201.

the last-named section.

Both the beginning and the ending of Proto-Luke as it is described here coincide with Luke's description of the πρῶτον λόγον in Acts 1:1-2. Proto-Luke starts with what Jesus began to do and teach: Luke 3:23--"Jesus when he began his ministry . . ." (καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος . . .). This is identical with Acts 1:1--"all . . . that Jesus began to do and teach . . . " (πάντων . . . ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν). Proto-Luke considers the ministry of the "Forerunner" and "Preparer of the Way," John the Baptist,[8] and the actual baptism of Jesus as Jesus' beginning of doing and teaching.[9] Precisely in this connection, then, Proto-Luke goes on to present within its contents a record of Jesus' "doings and teachings" until it ends, significantly, with his "being received up."[10] Compare this ending with Acts 1:2 " . . . until the day in which he was received up" (ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας . . . ἀνελήμφθη). It seems all but certain that it could not be the complete Third Gospel with its introduction and birth narratives to which Acts 1:1-2 refers, but it must be Proto-Luke, with which it coincides in both the

---

[8]Lk. 3:1-21.

[9]Lk. 3:22.

[10]Lk. 24:50-53 presents the narrative of the Ascension.

beginning and the ending.[11]

But this suggestion (that the πρῶτον λόγον of Acts 1:1 is actually Proto-Luke and not the Third Gospel as we now have it) gains even more strength when we conduct a close examination of Luke 1:1-4, the preface to the Third Gospel. In this preface Luke tells us that in the present work (the completed Third Gospel) he

> having followed all things closely for some time past, is about to write an orderly account for Theophilus, that Theophilus might know the truth concerning the things of which he had been informed. [My paraphrase]

Now, if Luke had previously written Proto-Luke[12] and that document had been read by Theophilus, and if Mark's Gospel had also been read by Theophilus[13] after he read Proto-Luke,[14] it seems altogether natural that Luke would write a third document to clear up any apparent discrepancies between the first two, Proto-Luke and Mark. That is

---

[11]Since the phrase "doing and teaching" is so general, it is not helpful to discuss further the content of Proto-Luke in the light of it. However, nowhere does Proto-Luke contain any elements which could not be considered either miracles (doings) or sayings (teachings) of Jesus.

[12]The date generally assigned to Proto-Luke is about 60-65 A. D., when Paul and Luke were in Caesarea or immediately after their departure for Rome.

[13]If Theophilus was a Roman government official and a Christian he almost certainly would have read Mark's Gospel as well as Luke's, since the former was composed in Rome.

[14]The date of Mark is about 65-66 A. D.

precisely what Luke did when he wrote the Third Gospel as we now have it.

Thus, in the Third Gospel as we now have it, Luke takes the newly written Gospel of Mark as his basis and weaves into it his own "former treatise" (Proto-Luke) in order to give an "orderly account" (καθεξῆς) of "the things which have been accomplished among us," which were already reported in a not-so-orderly account in both Proto-Luke and Mark. The "former treatise" (πρῶτον λόγον) of Acts 1:1 is Proto-Luke, not the Third Gospel as we now have it, which means that Acts 1:1 is not necessarily to be dated as having been written after the Third Gospel.

CHAPTER III

ARGUMENTS FOR THE PRIORITY OF ACTS OVER LUKE

If the πρῶτον λόγον of Acts 1:1 is shown to be "Proto-Luke" rather than the Third Gospel as we now have it, we are ready to go ahead to consider various arguments for the priority of Acts over Luke's Gospel. There are at least five of these.

A. Acts Shows No Awareness of the Seige of Jerusalem in 70 A. D., Although Luke Does.

In investigating the date of a book, the first step is to look for the latest event definitely referred to in the book. The internal historical allusions within these two documents seem to suggest a date after 70 A. D. for Luke and before 70 A. D. for Acts. Indeed, while the latest event of Luke seems to be the seige of Jerusalem in 70 A. D., we cannot find any allusion in Acts to known events which happened after the close of 63 A. D. Yet many significant events did occur between 63 and 70 A. D. which had a profound bearing upon the history of Christianity and which any historian writing after they occurred ought to

have known about and taken into account.

The question of whether the description of the destruction of Jerusalem in Luke 19:41-44 and especially in 21:20-24, when it is compared with the vaguer language of the parallel account in Mark 13:14-17, is a vaticinium ex eventu is itself a small storm-center in the Luke-Acts controversy. The generally accepted conclusion is that Luke modified Mark's account because of his knowledge of the event as having already taken place. Streeter states this position clearly:

> The point to notice is that Luke, who in the context is clearly following Mark, suddenly begins to modify the language of his source in an unusually drastic way, with the result that what in Mark 13 is a prophecy of the appearance of Anti-Christ in the Temple becomes, in Luke's version, a prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem and of the enslavement of its population. Now, seeing that in A. D. 70 the appearance of Anti-Christ did not take place, but things which Luke mentioned did, the alteration is most reasonably explained as due to the author's knowledge of these facts.[1]

However, R. B. Rackham,[2] T. W. Manson,[3] C. S. C. Williams,[4] and especially C. H. Dodd[5] have argued that the accounts in Luke 19 and 21 are not vaticinia ex eventu, but

---

[1]B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels, p. 540.

[2]R. B. Rackham, The Acts of the Apostles, p. liv.

[3]T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 320.

[4]C. S. C. Williams, "The Date of Luke-Acts," Expt. 64 (1952-53), 283-4.

[5]C. H. Dodd, "The Fall of Jerusalem," Journal of Roman Studies, 37 (1947), 46-54.

were written before 70 A. D. Both Harnack and Rackham argued that Luke 19:41-44 and 21:20-24 were written before 70 A. D. and were not concerned with the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem, but were a general prophecy of disaster based upon Old Testament predictions. Manson,[6] Williams,[7] and Dodd,[8] however, argue that, while Luke 19 and 21 are a prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem, it is not necessary to place these after the event, that is, after 70 A. D. Indeed, Dodd goes on to show that the language of Luke 19:43-44 is derived from the LXX and need not be attributed to Luke's knowledge of the special details of Jerusalem's destruction. He also is convinced that Luke 21:20-24 constitutes a "generalized picture of the fall of Jerusalem" and like Luke 19:43-44 need not be due to Luke's intimate knowledge of the 70 A. D. event.[9]

Pierson Parker recently averred that we should not try to explain away these passages as having no reference to 70 A. D., but that "It is much simpler to suppose that Luke rephrased the auguries because, in the wake of Jerusalem's destruction, he felt he knew what they meant.[10]

---

[6]T. W. Manson, Sayings, p. 320.

[7]C. S. C. Williams, "The Date of Luke-Acts," p. 283.

[8]C. H. Dodd, "The Fall of Jerusalem," p. 52.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Pierson Parker, "The 'Former Treatise,'" p.55.

This seems to fit the case very well. Whether Luke was on the front or the back side of Titus' invasion of Jerusalem when he wrote Luke 19:41-44 and 21:20-24 we cannot say for sure. Indeed, it is relatively unimportant to know. But that he had that invasion in mind when he wrote, and not some groundless fiction or imaginative disaster, is so certain as not to be open to serious question.

Having said this, we have located the latest sure historical allusion in the Third Gospel--70 A. D. We must now ask whether anything in Acts takes us to a point in history as late as this. The answer is "no." As will appear, Acts contains no single event nor any allusion to an event after 62 A. D. This, coupled with the fact of the abrupt ending of Acts, with Paul still awaiting trial in Rome (60-62 A. D.), with no mention of how the trial turned out, and no hint of his activity beyond 62 A. D., seems to prove beyond doubt the priority of Acts over Luke in time.[11]

B. Acts Indicates No Knowledge of the Neronian Persecution of 64 A. D.

---

[11]The theory that Luke planned a further volume to follow Acts' story would explain perhaps the abrupt ending of Acts, but such a theory would still not account for the lack of knowledge of Paul's trial, of Paul's letters, etc., as indicated in the remainder of this chapter. Furthermore, as the preface to Luke shows, the author of the Third Gospel intended to publish the two volumes (Luke-Acts) as one unit. For further study of the problem posed by the abrupt ending of Acts, see the following: Beginnings, IV, pp. 2, 349; V, pp. 336-38; Lindsey P. Pherigo, "Paul's Life After the Close of Acts," JBL, 70 (1951), 277-84.

It has been argued that Luke did not desire to anger the Romans and incur possible damage to the Gospel, and therefore refrained from mentioning their cruelties.[12] It has also been suggested that he intended to write a later book which would have dealt with this persecution in which both Peter and Paul lost their lives.[13] Still others suggest that it was too horrible for him to write about.[14] Each of these reasons for the failure of Acts to mention a persecution of Christians so intense and horrible as to cause the Roman historian Tacitus to feel disgust and pity,[15] and to arouse the people of Rome to such an extent that they feel constrained to offer hospitality to some previously despised Christians,[16] is far from satisfactory. Any sort of cordiality toward the memory of Nero, or toward the Romans in general, on the part of any Christian would have been egregious for a long time after 64 A. D. In that year Nero acquired a reputation so hateful among the

---

[12]Cf. Pierson Parker, "The 'Former Treatise,'" p. 54.

[13]Theodor Zahn, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Vol. V, p. 862. See also his "Das dritte buch des Lukas," in Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift, 28 (1917), 373-95.

[14]Cf. Pierson Parker, "The 'Former Treatise,'" p. 54.

[15]Tacitus, The Annals of Imperial Rome, p. 354.

[16]Ibid.

Christians[17] that it is impossible to think that Luke could have written with the easy optimism of Acts 28 for some years afterward.

It is not difficult, however, to imagine Luke writing with such easy optimism in A. D. 60-62. He had come to Rome with Paul, the Roman citizen, to fulfill the command given to Paul to "witness for Christ in Rome also" (Acts 19:21). The Holy Spirit had definitely directed Paul and Luke (16:6-10); they were being allowed to preach the Gospel in the capitol city "unhindered" (28:31); some were being converted (18:24). Thus, there was good reason for such optimism in A. D. 60-62, but there was no such reason for a long time after the Neronian persecution of A. D. 64.

C. Acts Admits No Dependence Upon Josephus

Despite some attempts to make Acts dependent upon Josephus, Acts seems to be free from that historian's influence.[18] Had Luke read Josephus, he could hardly have garbled the accounts of Theudas and Judas the Galilean as he did in Acts 5:36f. Further, the remembrance of the Egyptian insurrectionist is different in Acts 21:38 from Antiquities 20, 8, 6. And finally, the stories of Herod

---

[17]See, for example, the book of Revelation.

[18]Cf. Pierson Parker, "The 'Former Treatise,'" p. 53, and F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, pp. 24-26, 147-150.

Agrippa's death (Acts 12:21ff and Antiquities 19, 8, 2) are so different as to point to independent traditions.

While Antiquities was not published until about 93 A. D., Wars appeared in the early 70's. Besides this, Josephus was himself in Rome briefly in 64, and after 70 he settled there and lectured publicly. From the record in Acts 28:11-30 and II Timothy 4:10, Luke also lived in Rome for a time. He should have encountered Josephus' work. If Acts were written after 70 A. D., it is very hard to understand why Luke should not have used this valuable material.

D. Acts Indicates No Knowledge of the Disposition of Paul's Trial in Rome.

Acts' failure to record the climax of its last section, the actual trial of Paul before Nero, has provoked many and varied responses. J. de Zwaan[19] and R. B. Rackham[20] took the view that Luke died before he could finish writing his work. Others[21] conjectured that Luke intended to write a "third volume" and so stopped at this point. Some accept the dramatic ending of 28:30-31--"And he lived there two whole years at his own expense, and

---

[19]J. de Zwaan, "Was the Book of Acts a Posthumous Edition?" HTR, 17 (1924), 95-153.

[20]R. B. Rackham, The Acts of the Apostles, p. lv.

[21]J. Jeremias, NTD, IX, 1953, p. 2, and Theodor Zahn, note 13 above. For other conjectures, see Beginnings, IV, pp. 349-50.

welcomed all who came to him, preaching the kingdom of God and teaching about the Lord Jesus Christ quite openly and unhindered."--as a meaningful conclusion to the book.[22]

However, the first two suggestions do not account for the almost happy tone of Acts 28, and the third does not account for the elaborate build-up, over more than one-fourth of Acts, toward the missing trial and verdict. Unless Acts was written while Paul was still in Rome preaching the Gospel "unhindered," and before the actual trial and its verdict, it is difficult to understand why the author omits information available to both Clement of Rome[23] and the author of the Pastorals. It seems therefore that the author of Acts did not tell us of the disposition of Paul's trial in Rome because he did not know of it--it had not yet occurred.

E. Acts Indicates No Specific Knowledge of Paul's Letters.

When comparing the historical information which we gather from the Epistles with the narrative of Acts we meet several difficulties. If we compare the account of Paul's conversion and its sequel in Acts 9 with Paul's own narrative in Galatians 1, we find that Luke gives in greater detail that which Paul touches briefly (the actual

---

[22]F. F. Bruce, The Book of Acts, p. 536 n. 49.

[23]Clement's First Letter, 4:6, 7.

conversion); whereas the events of the following three years are given more fully in Galatians 1:15-17. Luke mentions no visit to Arabia; Paul does. The reason is that these details were important for Paul's argument in Galatians and were not important to Luke in Acts 9. Paul says that he went to Illyricum (Romans 15:19), but Acts does not mention it. I Corinthians 15:32 and II Corinthians 1:8-10 speak of "agonies at Ephesus," but Acts knows nothing of such agonies. The escape in a basket is recorded in II Corinthians 11:32f., where Paul represents the danger as coming from the ethnarch of Aretas; Luke says it came from the Jews. Although Acts often speaks of the animosity of the Jews and actually blames them for Paul's problems with the Roman civil authorities, it does not record the five beatings at their hands and the other sufferings mentioned in II Corinthians 11:25ff. Although interested in both Peter and Antioch, Acts is silent about Peter's work in that city recorded in Galatians 2:11f.

It seems almost certain that Luke would have referred to Paul's activities as reported by Paul himself in Galatians and the Corinthian correspondence if he had known these letters. That we find such obvious divergencies of reporting indicates that Luke had no knowledge of Paul's letters, for to know them and to ignore (if not to contradict) them, would have been impertinent and disrespectful. Acts is certainly neither impertinent nor disrespectful

when it comes to Paul. Furthermore, since Luke used sources in both the Gospel and in the first part of Acts, it stands to reason that if he had known Paul's letters, he would certainly have used them in the second part of Acts. Thus, we conclude that he did not know them.

Beyond these obvious conflicting or divergent reports, there is the vexed question of the correspondence of the Jerusalem visits of Acts 11:30 and Galatians 2:1ff. Galatians was addressed to South Galatian churches and is the earliest of Paul's extant epistles.[24] The visit of Acts 11:30 (Paul's second) and that of Galatians 2:1ff. are one and the same. The purpose of the visit is for the relief of famine. This is hinted at in Galatians 2:20. Paul's statement that he went up by revelation (Galatians 2:2) is explained by the prophecy of Agabus in Acts 11:28. The third visit of Paul to Jerusalem (Acts 15) is not mentioned in Galatians, and this is explained by the fact that the visit had not yet been made when Galatians was written. Otherwise, it is amazing that Paul does not refer to the Jerusalem Council and the Apostolic Decree which would certainly have provided convincing proof of his argument against the keeping of Jewish dietary laws by Christians.

Thus, while Acts throws a great amount of light

---

[24]See F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 38, who also refers to W. Ramsay, F. C. Burkitt, C. W. Emmet, G. S. Duncan.

upon the Pauline Epistles, and vice versa, regarding the question of the Jerusalem visits, there is no conscious alteration of either Acts or any of the Epistles to effect a correspondence of the various accounts. The Galatian account was the earlier account. The Acts account was later and was written completely independently of Galatians.

The cumulative effect of these facts leads one to conclude that the author of Acts was not familiar with Galatians or any of Paul's epistles for that matter. Paul's letters were not yet collected and generally known as they later came to be. Even Luke did not have access to them, nor did Paul himself. They were still in the hands of the leaders of the churches to whom they had been sent. It was not until after Paul's death that they were collected and published as a unit.[25] Thus, it appears that Acts must have been written before Paul's letters were collected.[26]

Conclusion

There is only one single conclusion to all these

---

[25]For further study of the Pauline Corpus, see E. J. Goodspeed, "Ephesians and the First Editions of Paul," JBL, 70 (1951), 285-91; and C. H. Buck, Jr., "The Early Order of the Pauline Corpus," JBL, 68 (1949), 351-57.

[26]Cf. Pierson Parker, "The 'Former Treatise,'" pp. 54-5, who cites F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, pp. 10-14; L. Cerfaux and J. Dupont, Les Actes des Apôtres, pp. 17f.

problems listed above. The reason that Acts (1) shows no awareness of the seige of Jerusalem in 70 A. D., (2) indicates no knowledge of the Neronian persecution of 64 A. D., (3) admits no dependence upon Josephus, (4) indicates no knowledge of the disposition of Paul's trial at Rome, and (5) indicates no specific knowledge of Paul's letters is that Acts was composed while Paul was a prisoner in Rome and Luke was still with him. Acts does not know of the above-mentioned facts and events simply because they were not known or had not yet happened in 62 A. D. when Acts was written.

PART III

THE PURPOSE FOR THE FINAL DRAFTING OF ACTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

If it is accepted that the author of Acts was a contemporary of Paul (whom we may without prejudice call "Luke"), and that he wrote in about 62 A. D. while Paul was still a prisoner in Rome, it follows that for much of his work he had his own first-hand knowledge as well as Paul's knowledge from which to draw. It seems very likely that the "we-sections" give the accounts of things in which Luke himself participated.[1] Whether he kept a diary, just

---

[1] 16:10-17; 20:5-15; 21:1-18; 27:1-28:16 See J. Dupont, The Sources of Acts, p. 76 n. 1: "It is usual to speak of three we-sections. In the first, the narrator is one of Paul's companions from Troas to Philippi; the narrative continues in the third person in 17:1 (the absence of 'we' between 16:18 and 16:40 has no significance--the passage treats of incidents concerning Paul and Silas alone). The second we-section begins at Philippi, at the time when Paul was passing through the town at the end of his last missionary journey (20:5); it continues as far as the arrival in Jerusalem (21:18). It is interrupted by the Miletus discourse (20:17-38) but it is clear that the narrator had no opportunity of indicating his presence in his account of the discourse; nor has the absence of 'we' after 21:18 any significance, since the events did not call for any intervention on the part of the narrator. The third section begins at the moment when Paul leaves Caesarea and continues until the arrival in Rome (28:16); here again it is difficult to define the limit, the end of the narrative being concerned with Paul alone. Several writers think it possible to add to these three we-sections the 'we' found in 11:28 in the Western text--a reading which has been called in question and which it seems preferable to ignore."

remembered, or filled out his accounts by conferring with Paul is beyond the possibility of sure knowledge. Perhaps all are true. The "outline" which served as a guideline to composition appears in Acts 1:8: "But you shall receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the end of the earth." Thus there are three major divisions within the book of Acts plus the conclusion: (1) The history of the church in Jerusalem under the leadership of Peter--1:12-5:43; (2) The history of the expansion of the Gospel in "all Judea and Samaria" through the efforts of outstanding persons of the Hellenistic-Jewish element[2] within the early church, such as Stephen, Philip, and Peter[3]--6:1-12:24; (3) The expansion of the Gospel to "the end of the earth"[4] through the effort of

---

[2]Cf. Acts 6:1ff.--Ἑλληνιστῶν . For a thorough study of the Hellenists see pp. 55-56 below.

[3]To call Peter a Hellenist is to go too far, especially if we adapt the definition of a Hellenist as "Greek-speaking (and largely Greek-thinking) Jews." However, we class Peter with the Hellenists here primarily because of his interest in carrying the Gospel beyond the confines of Jerusalem into predominantly Gentile territory.

[4]The argument as to whether or not this expression means Rome, as in I Clement 5:7 τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως may mean Rome, as in Ps. Sol. 8:16 απ εσχάτου τῆς γῆς is used of Pompey's coming to Rome, is not of critical importance. "Rome" may be in Luke's mind here since the book ends with Paul's witnessing in Rome. But the expression was also used in a general sense, as in 13:47, which is a citation from the LXX Isa. 49:6. Probably both "the end of the earth" in the general sense, and in the sense of the metropolis of Rome are in the mind of the author and no careful distinction is intended.

Paul--13:1-28:31.

Acts 1:12-5:43[5] must of necessity have come to Luke from some source or sources[6] other than Paul himself. Perhaps this was a collection of legends popular in the oral tradition of Luke's day, or even a written document drawn up as a sort of "Acts of Peter" either by Luke himself or by another. There is no strong reason, however, to attribute this section to another writer. It consists primarily of numerous clear-cut stories of Peter's exploits and of the changing circumstances within the early Jewish Christian church under his leadership. These are related in a straightforward manner and later they are paralleled by nearly identical exploits in the life and ministry of Paul and the changing circumstances within the Gentile Christian church under Paul's leadership. These "Acts of Peter" make up the first unit.

Acts 6:1-12:24 constitutes the second unit. Since Luke and Paul always went to the Gentiles and, even on their journey to Jerusalem and Rome, were not privileged to

---

[5]While 8:14-25; 9:32-11:18; 12:1-24 are all very similar to this section, it will be shown later that these passages belong to another section of the book.

[6]The problem of sources in Acts is extremely difficult. See J. Dupont, The Sources of Acts, p. 166, who after a most careful analysis of the question said, "Despite the most careful and detailed research, it has not been possible to define any of the sources used by the author of Acts in a way which will meet with widespread agreement among the critics."

to stay overnight with Christian leaders from Judea, we have none of the details of the expansion of the Gospel into Judea. Stephen's speech probably constitutes this step in Luke's mind.[7] The Sanhedrin members were representatives of "all Judea." It is probable that this section too was a separate collection of legends popular in the oral tradition of Luke's day, although it might have been a document written by Luke himself or by another. However, as was the case with the first section, there is no strong reason to commend the attribution of the section to another writer. It consists of the history of the expansion of the Gospel in "all Judea and Samaria" through the efforts of Stephen, Philip, and Peter. The common factor in all the exploits recorded in this section is that the heretofore Jerusalem-centered Gospel begins to move out of the place of its birth into wider circles. The heroes of the Hellenistic-Jewish branch of the early church[8] spread the Gospel beyond the confines of Jerusalem.

The final section of the book is comprised of the extensive material between 13:1-21:36 and 21:37-28:31.

---

[7]Cf. F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 23.

[8]For discussion of the Hellenists see O. Cullman, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," JBL, 74 (1955), 213-26, also in The Scrolls and the New Testament, edited by K. Stendahl, pp. 18-32; Marcel Simon, St. Stephen and the Hellenists.

This section was composed without any written sources.[9] Luke himself was present during much of the activity recorded here, and Paul was available to fill in the possible gaps in his knowledge. However, while Luke had no direct (written) sources, except perhaps his own diary, notes, or the like, he did have a pattern or patterns for the composition of his narrative in this section. He chose the incidents in Paul's ministry which paralleled those which he had from Peter's Jerusalem ministry (Acts 1:12-5:43), and that from the "Hellenists" Stephen and Philip, as well as Peter's non-Jerusalem exploits (Acts 6:1-12:24). We shall discuss these parallels in detail later. Suffice it to say here that there must have been a reason for this parallelism. Surely there were exciting and important events in the ministry of Paul which were left out of the Acts' account. One need only read the Pauline Epistles to recognize this.[10] The question is this: What is the purpose of the parallelism between Paul and the Jerusalem ministry of Peter, and between Paul and the non-Jerusalem ministry of Peter and the Hellenists? The answer to this question will provide us with the answer to the purpose of Acts.

---

[9]Cf. J. Dupont, The Sources of Acts, p. 167; F. F. Bruce, The Book of Acts, pp. 21-26.

[10]Especially II Corinthians 11:23-28; 12:1-9; Galatians 1:11-2:21.

The final section of Acts also includes 21:37 to the end. This is special material concerning Paul the prisoner. At no time from Acts 21:33 until the end of the book is Paul a free man. Luke was with him during all this time and records in clear, detailed fashion his defense of himself and his ministry before his accusers. As was the case with the material from 13:1-21:36, this material does not have a written source or sources. But again like 13:1-21:36, it does have a pattern. To this we shall return later also.

CHAPTER II

PETER-PAUL PARALLELS--IN DEFENSE OF PAUL'S APOSTLESHIP

As long ago as F. C. Bauer[1] and M. Schneckenburger[2] the parallelism between the so-called "Acts of Peter" and "Acts of Paul" was noted and attributed to Luke's desire to defend Paul's apostolic dignity. But, as Bruce argues against Bauer,[3] it does not follow that Luke invented the parallel incidents in order to minimize the difference between Peter and Paul. Rather, Luke merely selected from the record of actual events available to him those which best served the aim he had in view when he composed Acts.

These surprisingly numerous parallels are quite striking. They extend to miracles, speeches and other events. There are five parallel miracles, and all but one are in the same sequence within the narrative.

---

[1]F. C. Baur, "Über den Ursprung des Episcopats in der christlichen Kirche," TZT, Dritte Heft (1838), 1-185.

[2]M. Schneckenburger, Über den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte, 1841.

[3]F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 33.

Miracles in the Life of Peter

1. After Peter's speech, many signs and wonders were done by the apostles among the Jews in Jerusalem. (2:43)

2. Peter, in the company of John at the temple gate, heals the man lame from his mother's womb. (3:1f.)

3. Peter rebukes Ananias and Sapphira for deceit and hypocrisy. (5:1-11)

4. Peter delivered from prison by the angel of the Lord at night. (5:17-20)

5. Many signs and wonders were done by the apostles' hands and by Peter and the shadow of Peter was thought to heal the sick and those afflicted with unclean spirits. (5:12-16)

Miracles in the Life of Paul

1. After Paul and Barnabas spoke, many signs and wonders were done by Paul and Barnabas among the Gentiles in Asia Minor. (14:3)

2. Paul, in the company of Barnabas at Lystra, heals the man lame from birth. (14:8ff.)

3. Paul rebukes the spirit in the slave girl for deceit and hypocrisy. (16:16-24)

4. Paul delivered from stocks by an earthquake at midnight. (16:25-26)

5. God did extraordinary miracles by the hands of Paul, and handkerchiefs or aprons were carried away from his body to the sick and those afflicted with evil spirits. (19:11-12)

1. Signs and Wonders 2:43 and 14:3

Here we have the two leading Christian apostles speaking, after which signs and wonders are performed. A parallelism occurs in the use in both places of the expression common in LXX and New Testament vocabulary τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα (cf. also ver. 19; 4:30; 5:12; 6:8; 7:36; 15:12). Perhaps the use of this expression at the beginning of Acts' record of the ministries of Peter and Paul serves to indicate that both ministries are part of the advent of the new Messianic age[4] started by Jesus. This is possibly the author's way of indicating divine approval upon both ministries as well as showing the similarity between them. If Peter's ministry as the chief of the Jerusalem apostles was blessed with signs and wonders, so was Paul's equally blessed, since he was the chief of the apostles to the Gentiles.

2. Healing of the Lame Man 3:1f. and 14:8ff.

That these two stories are parallels, the one patterned upon the other, is undeniable. First, the same phrase is used in both places to indicate the malady involved, "cripple from his mother's womb: χωλος ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ. Second, both apostles followed the same procedure leading up to the miracle, they "looked intently" upon the lame man: ἀτενίσας δὲ Πέτρος εἰς αὐτὸν, and Paul

[4]See F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 100.

ἀτενίσας αὐτῷ. Finally, the result was the same, the lame man "leaped up and walked": καὶ ἐξαλλόμενος ἔστη, καὶ περιεπάτει (3:8); καὶ ἥλατο καὶ περιεπάτει (14:10).

Again, it seems clear that the author of Acts is demonstrating the apostleship of Paul by comparing his miracle of healing to that of Peter, the chief of the apostles of Jerusalem. It is as if he were saying, "If Peter is accepted as a great apostle of the new age, then so must Paul also be accepted as an apostle of the new age, for his miracles are equally as great as those of Peter."

3. Deceit and Hypocrisy Rebuked

While there are no direct parallels of linguistic forms in these two stories, they are most certainly parallel in regard to their basic elements. In Acts 5 Ananias and Sapphira are deceitful in lying to the Holy Ghost and to Peter under the influence of Satan.[5] They hold back a portion of the proceeds of the sale of their property which had been dedicated to the Church. In Acts 16 the slave girl is deceitful (or the evil spirit within her is) in that she endeavors to identify herself and her evil spirit with the Spirit which worked through Paul and Barnabas.

---

[5]For a study of the meaning of "Satan," see F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, pp. 132-33. Hebrew sātān is a common noun, meaning "adversary." He is identified with the serpent who deceived Eve, and true to his pristine character, is still "the deceiver of the world". (Cf. Rom. 16:20; 2 Cor. 11:2f; Rev. 12:9; 20:2).

It is trickery and deception which is the cause for the apostolic action which follows in both cases.

In Acts 5 Peter pronounces the judgment of death upon Ananias and Sapphira. In Acts 16 Paul casts the spirit of divination out of the possessed slave girl. Whether or not the story of Ananias and Sapphira actually happened as it is recorded in Acts 5:1-11, or whether it is a legend which had already been embellished to the point of distortion in oral tradition before the author of Acts took it over, is impossible to know for sure. Nor is it important to our parallelism. The author of Acts wrote Acts 16 in order to demonstrate Paul's authority over the evil spirit of deceit and hypocrisy, just as the story of Ananias and Sapphira in the "Acts of Peter" (Acts 5) demonstrated Peter's power over the evil spirit of deceit and hypocrisy. Any apostolic authority which had been committed to Peter was also committed to Paul. They were equal, therefore, in apostolic authority.

4. Deliverance from Prison 5:17-20 and 16:25-26

Again we see the exact parallelism between a miraculous occurrence in the lives of Peter and Paul. Both are delivered from prison "at night." Whether one sees the influence of a Greek convention as to the way in which escape stories were told in the literary period which includes Acts, or one sees every detail of the different escape

stories as true and factual history is unimportant to our argument here. The fact of the parallelism is sufficient for our case. That which the author of Acts is saying by drawing such a parallel is this: If God would intervene to free Peter from prison to carry out his apostolic work, so would he intervene for Paul, who is equally an apostle.

5. Extraordinary Miracle Performed Through Peter's Shadow (5:12-16) and Paul's Handkerchiefs or Aprons (19:11-12).

Finally, there is the striking parallel of healing through means, i.e., Peter's shadow and Paul's handkerchiefs or aprons. Both stories begin by saying that "many signs were done by the hands of the apostles" (5:12), or Paul (19:11). In both cases the people spontaneously come to Peter and Paul for healing. Peter's shadow fell upon them and they were healed of sickness and unclean spirits left them. The handkerchiefs and aprons[6] taken from the body of Paul performed the same miracles of deliverance.

Again the parallelism is undeniable. If God granted the apostle Peter such extraordinary miraculous power, he also has granted this same power to Paul. Therefore,

---

[6] Σουδάρια σιμικίνθια = kerchiefs worn on the head to keep the perspiration out of the eyes during work--"sweat-rags," cf. Lk. 19:20; Jo. 11:44; 20:7; and aprons worn at the work bench. It is interesting to compare the effects of both Paul's apron and Peter's shadow with those of Jesus' tassel (Lk. 8:44).

they are both equally God's apostles.

All of these parallels demonstrate the apostolic equality of Peter and Paul, and this is precisely Luke's purpose in choosing these particular incidents from Paul's life to form his book. Clearly, he is saying through each of them: If Peter is an apostle (and he is certainly the chief of apostles), then so is Paul equal to Peter since God has performed through Paul every miracle which he performed through Peter.

There are also five major parallel speeches in the lives of the two leading figures of Acts. They, too, are in perfect sequential order within the narrative.

Since a very detailed description of the parallels within the contents of the speeches given here may be found in the pages which follow, such a discussion is not necessary at this point. Let it suffice here simply to say that the very presence of these parallels is enough to demonstrate again the basic argument of this section, that Paul is an apostle of Jesus Christ equal to Peter in every way. That some of the speeches were made by persons other than Peter and Paul (indeed, Peter himself actually gives one speech listed here under "Speeches in the Life of Paul") does not afford any real problem as far as our argument is concerned. The speeches are parallel in their content and in their results upon the ministries of the two apostles.

Speeches in the Life of Peter

1. Peter speaks (1:15-22)
   Matthias is chosen.

2. Peter's sermon (2:14-43)
   "Repent and Believe in
   Jesus" is the theme.

3. Peter's speech (3:12-26
   "Jesus alone is worthy
   of praise" is the theme.

4. Peter's speech (4:8-12)
   "Salvation through Jesus
   alone" is the theme.

5. Gamaliel's speech (5:34-39)
   A leader of Judaism speaks
   in defense of Jewish
   Christianity.

Speeches in the Life of Paul

1. The Holy Spirit speaks (13:2)
   Paul and Barnabas are chosen.

2. Paul's sermon (13:15-32)
   "Repent and believe in
   Jesus" is the theme.

3. Paul's speech (14:15-17)
   "Jesus alone is worthy
   of praise" is the theme.

4. Peter's speech (15:7-11)
   "Salvation through Jesus
   alone" is the theme.

5. James' speech (15:13-21)
   A leader of Jewish Christian-
   ity speaks in defense of
   Gentile Christianity.

While the very presence of these parallels is in itself significant, it is even more significant that the entire first section of Acts, which we have designated the "Acts of Peter," is paralleled within Acts by similar material in which Paul is the central hero.

PETER	PAUL
1:12-2:13--Decisions within the Jerusalem ministry. Specific parallels: Jerusalem Devoted themselves to prayer Peter spoke and quoted Scripture in which the Holy Spirit spoke. Matthias set apart to serve. The Holy Spirit fell upon them	13:1-3--Decisions within the Antioch ministry. Specific parallels: Antioch Worshipping and fasting The Holy Spirit spoke Barnabas and Saul set apart to serve They laid hands upon them
2:14-43--Peter's sermon Specific parallels: Standing "Men of Judea and all who dwell in Jerusalem . . . give ear to my words." Speech includes: David Jesus Resurrection Witnesses Psalm--"Holy One to see corruption" David died God hath made Jesus both Lord and Christ	13:15-52--Paul's sermon Specific parallels: Standing "Men of Israel and you that fear God, listen . . . Speech includes: David Jesus Resureection Witnesses Psalm--"Holy One to see corruption" David died Through this man forgiveness of sins is proclaimed to you and believing you are freed from everything from which the law could not free you.
Results of the speech: The people were cut to the heart and said, "What shall we do?" And he testified to many and three thousand souls were added that day. They continued in the apostles' teaching breaking bread and in fellowship.	Results of the speech: The people begged that these things be told the next sabbath. And many Jews and devout converts followed Paul and Barnabas the next sabbath with the whole town. The Jews become jealous and Paul and Barbabas turn to Gentiles. The Gentiles are glad, but the Jews and some women stir up opposition. Therefore, Paul and Barbabas leave for Iconium. The disciples were filled with joy and the Holy Spirit.
2:43-47--Results--Union Specific parallels: Fear came upon every soul. Many wonders and signs were done.	14:1-7--Results--Division Specific parallels: A great company believed. Signs and wonders were done.

All who believed had all things common with <u>undivided</u> hearts.	The unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles and poisoned their minds against the brethren and they were <u>divided</u>.
The Lord added to their number day by day those who were being saved.	When an attempt was made by both Gentiles and Jews with their rulers to molest them and to stone them, they learned of it and fled to Lystra . . . and there preached the Gospel.
3:1-26--Man Lame From Birth Healed	14:8-18--Man Lame From Birth Healed
<u>Specific parallels</u>:	<u>Specific parallels</u>:
At the Temple	At Lystra
Peter and John	Paul and Barnabas
Lame from birth	Lame from birth
Peter directed his gaze at him.	Paul looked intently at him.
He . . . expected to receive something from them (probably alms).	He had faith to be made well.
Leaping up he stood and walked.	He sprang up and walked.
And all the people saw him walking . . . and they were filled with wonder and amazement.	And when the crowd saw what Paul had done they lifted up their voice . . . "The gods have come down to us in the likeness of men."
While he clung to Peter and John, all the people ran to them astounded.	They wanted to offer sacrifice.
When Peter saw it he addressed the people, "Men of Israel, why do you stare at us, as though by our own power or piety we made him walk? The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the God of our Fathers has glorified His servant Jesus."	When the apostles Barnabas and Paul heard of it, they tore their garments and rushed out among the multitude crying, "Men, why are you doing this? We also are men, of like nature with you, and bring you good news that you should turn from these vain things to a living God who made heaven and earth and the sea and all that is in them."
<u>Peter's Speech</u>:	<u>Paul's Speech</u>:
Theme: Only God, not man, is worthy of praise.	Theme: Only God, not man, is worthy of praise.

The parallels in this section are quite obvious. Both groups of viewers were amazed at the miracle performed. Both apostles discounted personal credit for it. Both apostles gave God credit for it and then gave speeches with identical themes.

4:1-4--Results of Peter's Speech

Specific parallels:

The Jews interrupt and detain the apostles until the next day.

"And as they were speaking to the people, the priests and the captain of the temple and the Sadducees came upon them, annoyed because they were teaching the people and proclaiming the resurrection from the dead.

"And they arrested them and put them in custody until the morrow, for it was already evening.

Many believe through hearing the Gospel.

"But many who heard the word believed; and the number of the men came to about five thousand."

4:5-12--Salvation Through Jesus Alone

Specific parallels:

Jews pose a question to the disciples.

"On the morrow their rulers and elders and scribes were gathered together in Jerusalem, with Annas the high priest and Caiaphas and John and Alexander, and all who were of the high-priestly family. And when they had set them in the midst, they inquired, 'By what power or by what name did you do this?'"

Peter answers: Salvation is through Jesus alone."

"Then Peter, filled with the Holy Spirit, said to them, 'Rulers of the people and elders, . . . by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth . . . this man is standing before you well. . . . And there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved.'"

14:19-23--Results of Paul's Speech

Specific parallels:

The Jews interrupt and detain the apostles until the next day.

"But the Jews came there from Antioch and Iconium; and having persuaded the people, they stoned Paul and dragged him out of the city, supposing that he was dead. But when the disciples gathered about him, he rose up and entered the city.

"And on the next day he went on with Barnabas to Derbe.

Many believe through hearing the Gospel.

"When they had preached the gospel to that city and had made many disciples, . . . they committed them to the Lord in whom they believed."

15:1-11--Salvation Through Jesus Alone

Specific parallels:

Judeans impose "requirements for salvation" upon disciples.

"But some men came down from Judea and were teaching the brethren, . . . 'Unless you are circumcised according to the custom of Moses, you cannot be saved.'"

Peter answers: "Salvation is through Jesus alone."

"Peter rose and said to them, 'Brethren, you know that in the early days God made choice among you, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and believe. And God who knows the heart bore witness to them, giving them the Holy Spirit just as he did to us; and he made no distinction between us and them, but cleansed their hearts by faith. Now therefore why do you make trial of God by putting a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear? But we believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, just as they will.'"

4:13-22--"Official" Reaction to Signs and Wonders of the Gospel: Set Free with Warning

Specific parallels:

". . . they conferred with one another, saying, 'What shall we do with these men? For that a notable sign has been performed through them is manifest to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and we cannot deny it. But in order that it may spread no further among the people, let us warn them to speak no more to any one in this name.

5:1-11--Peter Exercises Charismatic Gift "Discerning of Spirits" and Rebukes Ananias and Sapphira

Specific parallels:

Deception

"But a man named Ananias with his wife Sapphira sold a piece of property, and with his wife's knowledge he kept back some of the proceeds, and brought only a part and laid it at the apostles' feet.

Peter rebukes them

"But Peter said, 'Ananias, why has Satan filled your heart to lie to the Holy Spirit and to keep back part of the proceeds of the land? While it remained unsold, did it not remain your own? And after it was sold, was it not at your disposal? How is it that you have contrived this deed in your heart? You have not lied to man but to God.'

"When Ananias heard these words, he fell down and died. And great fear came upon all who heard of it. The young men rose and wrapped him up and carried him out and buried him.

"After an interval of about three hours, his wife came in, not knowing what had happened. And Peter said to her, 'Tell me whether you sold the land for so much.' And she said, 'Yes, for so much.' But Peter said to her, 'How is it that you have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord? Hark, the feet of those that have buried your husband are at the door, and they will carry you out.'" Immediately she fell down at his feet and died. When the young men came in they found her dead, and they carried her out and buried her beside her husband. And great fear came upon the whole church and upon all who heard of these things.

15:12-35--"Official" Reaction to Signs and Wonders of the Gospel: Set Free with Warning

Specific parallels:

". . . they listened to Barnabas and Paul as they related what signs and wonders God had done through them among the Gentiles. After they finished speaking, James replied, . . . Therefore my judgment is that we should not trouble those of the Gentiles who turn to God, but should write to them to abstain from the pollutions of idols and from unchastity and from what is strangled and from blood."

16:16-18--Paul Exercises Charismatic Gift "Discerning of Spirits" and Rebukes Girl Who Had a Spirit of Divination

Specific Parallels:

Deception

"As we were going to the place of prayer, we were met by a slave girl who had a spirit of divination and brought her owners much gain by soothsaying. She followed Paul and us, crying, 'These men are servants of the Most High God who proclaim to you the way of salvation.'"

Paul rebukes her

"But Paul was annoyed, and turned and said to the spirit, 'I charge you in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her.' And it came out that very hour."

5:12-16--Peter's Shadow Has Healing Power

Specific parallels:

"Now many signs and wonders were done among the people by the hands of the apostles. And they were all together in Solomon's Portico. None of the rest dared join them, but the people held them in high honor. And more than ever believers were added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women, so that they even carried out the sick into the streets, and laid them on beds and pallets, that as Peter came by at least his shadow might fall on some of them. The people also gathered from the towns around Jerusalem, bringing the sick and those afflicted with unclean spirits and they were all healed.

19:11-12--Paul's Clothes Have Healing Power

Specific parallels:

"And God did extraordinary miracles by the hands of Paul, so that handkerchiefs or aprons were carried away from his body to the sick, and diseases left them and the evil spirits came out of them.

5:17-21--Miraculous Deliverance From Prison

Specific parallels:

"But the high priest rose up and all who were with him, that is, the party of the Sadducees, and filled with jealousy they arrested the apostles and put them in prison.

But at night an angel of the Lord opened the prison doors and brought them out and said, "Go and stand in the temple and speak to the people all the words of this life." And when they heard this they entered the temple at daybreak and taught.

16:19-34--Miraculous Deliverance From Prison

Specific parallels:

" . . . And when they had inflicted many blows upon them, they threw them into prison, charging the jailer to keep them safely. Having received this charge, he put them into the inner prison and fastened their feet in the stocks.

But about midnight Paul and Silas were praying and singing hymns to God, and the prisoners were listening to them, and suddenly there was a great earthquake, so that the foundations of the prison were shaken; and immediately all the doors were opened and every one's fetters were unfastened.

When the jailer woke and saw that the prison doors were open, he drew his sword and was about to kill himself, supposing that the prisoners had escaped. But Paul cried with a loud voice, "Do not harm yourself, for we are all here." And he called for lights and rushed in, and trembling with fear he fell down before Paul and Silas, and brought them out and said, "Men, what must I do to be saved?" And they said, "Believe in the Lord Jesus, and you will be saved, you and your household." And they spoke the word of the Lord to him and to all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their wounds, and he was baptized at once, with all his family. Then he brought them up into his house, and set food before them; and he rejoiced with all his household that he had believed in God.

5:21b-42--Consequences of the Miraculous Deliverance: They Are Set Free.

Now the high priest came and those who were with him and called together the council and all the senate of Israel, and sent to the prison to have them brought. But when the officers came, they did not find them in the prison, and they returned and reported, "We found the prison securely locked and the sentries standing at the doors, but when we opened it we found no one inside." Now when the captain of the temple and the chief priests heard these words, they were much perplexed about them, wondering what this would come to. And some one came and told them, "The men whom you put in prison are standing in the temple and teaching the people." Then the captain with the officers went and brought them, but without violence, for they were afraid of being stoned by the people.

And when they had brought them, they set them before the council. And the high priest questioned them, saying, "We strictly charged you not to teach in this name, yet here you have filled Jerusalem with your teaching and you intend to bring this man's blood upon us." But Peter and the youths answered, "We must obey God rather than men. The God of our father raised Jesus whom you killed by hanging him on a tree. God exalted him at his right hand as Leader and Savior, to give repentence to Israel and forgiveness of sins. And we are witnesses to these things, and so is the Holy Spirit whom God has given to those who obey him." When they heard this they were enraged and wanted to kill them. But a Pharisee in the council named Gamaliel, a teacher of the law, held in honor by all the people stood up and ordered the men to be put outside for awhile. And he said to them, "Men of Israel, take care what you do with these men. For before these days Theudas arose, giving himself out to be somebody, and a number of men, about four hundred, joined him; but he was slain and all who followed him were dispersed and came to nothing. After him Judas the Galilean arose in the days of the census and drew away some of the people after him; he also perished, and all who followed him were scattered. So in the present case I

16:35-17:9--Consequences of the Miraculous Deliverance: They Are Set Free.

But when it was day, the magistrates sent the police, saying, 'Let those men go.' And the jailer reported the words to Paul, saying, "The Magistrates have sent to let you go; now therefore come out and go in peace." But Paul said to them, "They have beaten us publicly, uncondemned, men who are Roman citizens, and have thrown us into prison; and do they now cast us out secretly? No! let them come themselves and take us out."

The police reported these words to the magistrates, and they were afraid when they heard that they were Roman citizens; so they came and apologized to them. And they took them out and asked them to leave the city. Now when they had passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia, they came to Thessalonica where there was a synagogue of the Jews. (In they came to the synagogue of the Jews.) And Paul went in, as was his custom, and for three weeks (sabbaths) he argued with them, from the Scriptures, explaining and proving that it was necessary for the Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead, and saying, "This Jesus, whom I proclaim to you, is the Christ." And some of them were persuaded, and joined Paul and Silas; as did a great many of the devout Greeks and not a few of the leading women. But the Jews were jealous, and taking some wicked fellows of the rabble, they gathered a crowd, set the city in an uproar, and attacked the house of Jason, seeking to bring them out to the people. And when they could not find them, they dragged Jason and some of the brethren before the city authorities, crying, "These men who have turned the world upside down have come here also, and Jason has received them; and they are all acting against the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another king, Jesus."

tell you, keep away from these men and let them alone; for if this plan or this undertaking is of men, it will fail; but if it is of God, you will not be able to overthrow them. You might even be found opposing God!" So they took his advice, and when they had called in the apostles, they beat them and charged them not to speak in the name of Jesus, and let them go. Then they left the presence of the council rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer dishonor for the name. And every day in the temple and at home they did not cease teaching and preaching Jesus as the Christ.

And the people and the city authorities were disturbed when they heard this. And when they had taken security from Jason and the rest, they let them go.

The last two passages, which we have entitled simply "Consequences of the Miraculous Deliverance," are parallel, not so much in the use of linguistic formulations as in basic content. In both cases there was an outcry of protest by the people, an examination of the facts involved by the leaders of the people, and setting the Christians free.

What are we to make of this evidence? What is the aim Luke had in mind in writing this section of Acts? It seems undeniable that this parallelism was intentional and not just accidental. Each miracle of Peter is duplicated by one of Paul's; each speech in the life of Peter is paralleled by one in the life of Paul. That Luke consciously adapted his "biography" of Paul to a previous record of Peter seems certain. Luke's purpose must be the defense of Paul's apostleship on an equal level with that of Peter. This conclusion is strengthened by the presence of a similar parallelism in the second section of Acts.

CHAPTER III

HELLENISTS-PAUL PARALLELS--IN DEFENSE OF PAUL'S GENTILE MINISTRY

Much has been written regarding these Ἑλληνιστῶν: Στέφανον, Φίλιππον, Πρόχοραν, Νικάνορα, Τίμωνα, Παρμενᾶν, Νικόλαον. Were they Greek-speaking Jews?[1] Were they Jewish proselytes who had joined the church?[2] Were they Greek-speaking Gentiles who had been converted at Pentecost?[3] Were they members of a party within the early church which was opposed to the Ἰουδαϊστής?[4] Perhaps the answer to the knotty question of who the Hellenists were is not available to us at this point.[5] However, it is clear that Luke has a

---

[1]This is the usual explanation for them, and it dates back to John Chrysostom. See F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 151.

[2]E. C. Blackman, ET, xlviii (1936-37), 524f.

[3]H. J. Cadbury, Beginnings, V, p. 59.

[4]O. Cullman, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," pp.25-26.

[5]For further study see F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 151, who argues for "Greek-speakers" as the best identification. He is then willing to allow the context to determine more exactly what kind of "Greek-speakers" are meant. In 9:29--probably Greek-speaking Jews in the synagogue; in 11:20--probably Gentiles.

special interest in their work. He has that interest because that work was directed beyond Jerusalem. It was the Hellenists who were first responsible for spreading the Gospel beyond the city of its beginnings and introducing it to the element of universality.[6]

Luke seizes upon this fact together with the oral or written legends about the Hellenists in order to defend the Gentile ministry of Paul. Paul was on trial for proclaiming the Gospel to Gentiles, among other things. Indeed, it was his Gentile ministry and his witness to it that brought down upon him the wrath of the Jews in Jerusalem and led to his initial arrest by the Roman tribune, Claudius Lysias (Acts 22:21-24). Yet he was not alone in this. He had been preceded by some of the earliest and best-known Jerusalem Christians--Stephen, Philip, even Peter himself. It is Luke's purpose in this second section of Acts to justify the nature of Paul's ministry (to the Gentiles) by showing that such a universalizing of the Gospel had already begun within the Jerusalem Christian community itself.

A. Speeches of Stephen and Paul

The lengthy speech of Stephen in Acts 6:8-7:60 has a parallel in Paul's Aeropagus address in 17:16-34. The former is addressed to Jews and the latter to Gentiles.

---

[6]O. Cullman, "The Beginnings of Christianity," p. 25, calls them "the real founders of Christian missions."

The basic theme of both speeches is identical: God does not dwell in idolatrous temples made with hands, but, being the Maker of all things and the ruler of heaven and earth, is to be served and worshipped by all men everywhere.

6:8-7:60
Stephen's Speech
to Jews

After reciting the familiar history of God's dealings with Israel, Stephen proclaims the climax and basic thesis of his message:

"The Most High does not dwell in houses made with hands, as the prophet says, 'Heaven is my throne and earth is my footstool. What house will you build for me, says the Lord, or what is the place of my rest? Did not my hand make all these things?'

"You stiff-necked people, uncircumcised in heart and ears, you always resist the Holy Spirit. As your fathers did, so do you. Which of the prophets did not your fathers persecute? And they killed those who announced beforehand the coming of the Righteous One, whom you have now betrayed and murdered, you who received the law as delivered by angels and did not keep it."

17:16-34
Paul's Speech
to Gentiles

Paul's spirit was disturbed within him as he saw the city of Athens full of idols, and he said:

"Men of Athens, I perceive that in every way you are very religious. For as I passed along and observed the objects of your worship, I found also an altar with the inscription, 'To an unknown god.' What therefore you worship as unknown, this I proclaim to you. The God who made the world and everything in it, being Lord of heaven and earth, does not live in shrines made by man, nor is he served by human hands, as though he needed anything, since he himself gives to all men life and breath and everything. And he made from one every nation of men to live on all the face of the earth, having determined allotted periods and the boundaries of their habitation, that they might feel after him and find him. Yet he is not far from each one of us, for 'In him we live and move and have our being'; as even some of your poets

> have said, 'For we are indeed his offspring.' Being the God's offspring, we ought not to think that the Deity is like gold, or silver, or stone, a representation by the art and imagination of man. The times of ignorance God overlooked, but now he commands all men everywhere to repent, because he has fixed a day on which he will judge the world in righteousness, by a man whom he has appointed, and of this he has given assurance to all men by raising him from the dead."

The parallel themes are immediately evident: "God, the Creator of all things, does not dwell in shrines made by human hands, but is to be worshipped by all men everyshere." This is in keeping with the message of the Book of Acts as a whole. The Gospel is greater than a single nation or people; it belongs to the world. Certainly, Luke admits, this was Paul's message. But it was also the message of this outstanding member of the earliest Christian community, Stephen. The Gentile ministry of Paul is not unique to Paul; it is only the continuation of the original ministry of the Jerusalem church.

However, the parallelism extends not just to the basic themes of the two speeches. It is apparent also in the manner in which the theme is expressed in each of the speeches. Specific parallels are to be seen in (1) the statement that God does not live in shrines or houses made

by human hands, (2) the fact of God's creatorship, and (3) the fact of man's unrighteous betrayal of God through his sin (note underlinings above).

B. Exploits of Philip

In Acts 8:5-13 Philip enters Samaria and encounters there Simon Magus, who is converted through the signs and the preaching of Philip. In 8:26-40 Philip leaves Samaria southward to the desert road that goes down from Jerusalem to Gaza. There he encounters an Ethiopian eunuch, a minister of Candace, queen of the Ethiopians. He is converted and baptized by Philip. Afterward Philip preached in all the towns between Azotus and Caesarea, where he finally settled. Azotus, the old Philistine city of Ashdod, lay about twenty miles north of Gaza and thirty-five miles west of Jerusalem. Beginning here Philip preached in all the cities of the Shepelah or low coast-land. These cities were probably Jamnia, Lydda, Joppa, and Antipatris, all of which contained a large Gentile population.[7]

That these exploits of Philip are told for the purpose of demonstrating the spread of the Gospel beyond Jerusalem is clear. Cullmann says that these Hellenists

> were in fact the real founders of Christian missions, in that the persecution following the death of Stephen . . . they began to preach the Gospel in Samaria. Universality was not introduced into Christianity first by Paul but by the Hellenists

---

[7]R. B. Rackham, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 124.

before him.[8]

This is precisely the purpose of Luke in recording Philip's missionary excursions. He wanted to demonstrate the fact that Paul's Gentile mission was not original with him but that the Gospel was inherently universal and even members of the early Jerusalem community had recognized this.

C. Peter's Non-Jerusalem Exploits and Paul

In Acts 8:14-17 Peter lays hands upon Samaritan believers and they receive the Holy Spirit. In 19:1-7 Paul lays hands upon Ephesian believers and they also receive the Holy Spirit. In 8:18-25 Peter confronts a magician, Simon, and rebukes him for deceit and hypocrisy. In 13:6-12 Paul confronts a magician, Elymas, and rebukes him for deceit and hypocrisy.

Immediately following the record of Saul's conversion (9:1-31), the story of the healing of Aeneas, the paralytic, by Peter is told in 9:32-35. In 28:7-8 Paul performs a similar miracle when he heals the father of his host, Publius, of fever and dysentery.

In 9:36-43 Peter raises Tabitha from death; in 20:7-12 Paul raises Eutychus. There follows immediately upon the Tabitha incident the Cornelius episode and Peter's defense of the Gentile mission in 10:1-11:18. This is

---

[8]O. Cullman, "The Beginnings of Christianity," p. 25.

paralleled by Paul's activity at Ephesus recorded in 19:1-10.

Peter is shown as the "bringer of the Gospel to Gentiles" in the encounter with Cornelius, the God-fearer[9] and centurion of the Italic σπείρης at Caesarea.[10] The twice-told vision of the sheet especially emphasizes the Gentile emphasis. Verse 34 settles matters once for all for Peter. He says:

> Truly I perceive that God shows no partiality, but in every nation any one who fears him and does what is right is acceptable to him.

As the sermon of Peter continues there is an interruption:

> While Peter was still saying this, the Holy Spirit fell on all who heard the word. And the believers from among the circumcised who came with Peter were amazed, because the gift of the Holy Spirit had been poured out even on the Gentiles. For they heard them speaking in tongues and extolling God. (10:44-46)

Paul's experience at Ephesus matches Peter's

---

[9]A Gentile who, though not a full proselyte, attached himself to the Jewish religion, practiced its monotheistic and imageless worship, attended the synagogue, observed the Sabbath and food laws.

[10]T. R. S. Broughton, B. C., V, pp. 427-45; F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 215, "A σπείρης was a cohort (Lat. cohors), the tenth part of a legion, and had a paper strength of 600 men. We have inscriptional evidence of the presence in Syria in A. D. 69 of the auxiliary cohors II Italica civium Romanorum (Dessau ILS 9168), and it may have been there or near there at an earlier date. From A. D. 6 to 41 we have no direct evidence of the identity of the military units in Palestine. From 41 to 44, when Agrippa I reigned, his troops at Caesarea seem to have consisted mainly of καισαρεῖς καὶ Σεβαστηνοί (Josephus, Antiquities, 19, 9, 1f.)."

experience at Caesarea. Paul encountered the Gentile Ephesians who had been baptized into John's (the Baptist) baptism. Then Paul told them of Jesus with this result:

> On hearing this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them; and they spoke with tongues and prophesied. (19:5-6)

In verses 8-10 when the Jewish synagogues are closed to him, Paul goes to the Gentiles of Asia.

The last that we see of Peter in Acts is at chapter 12. Peter is arrested and subsequently delivered from prison in 12:1-17. He exits from the story of Acts at this high point with the simple word: "And he departed to another place." The story of the death of Herod Agrippa I follows in verses 18-23. This is undoubtedly a popular legend which circulated in oral form among the Christians. It served to add luster to the deliverance of Peter from prison and to his own person as well. Josephus tells the same story of Herod's death with several varying details.[11] The conclusion of section two is in 12:24: "But the word of God grew and multiplied."[12]

---

[11]Josephus, Antiquities, 19, 8, 2. Ed. Meyer, Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums, Vol. 3, pp. 167f., says that "In outline, in date, and in the general conception, both accounts are in full agreement."

[12]Verse 25 is a connecting verse between the first two sections of Acts (1-12) and the final two sections (chapters 13-28). Although there is an interesting textual difficulty there, the verse is of no especial importance to us here.

Now in correspondence with this episode in the life of Peter there is a very similar instance in the life of Paul as recorded in 19:11-20. It is another popular legend concerning the seven sons of Sceva. It is the only New Testament example of ἐξορκιστής, and the oldest known example of it. It appears also in Lucian, Ptolemy, and the Greek Fathers.

The conclusion of this group of stories about Paul is found in verse 20. It corresponds exactly with that which ends the first half of Acts (12:24, see above). It is: "So the Word of the Lord grew and prevailed mightily." From this point Paul's direction is toward Rome (verse 21: " . . . I must also see Rome.") Like Jesus when He turned His face toward Jerusalem, Paul now turns his own face toward Rome for the final conflict. The shadow of Rome will loom over Paul from this moment on.

That the purpose of this section of Acts is to defend Paul's Gentile ministry seems clear, then, from the above. Paul's statement that God had sent him to witness to the Gentiles is the immediate cause which precipitated his initial arrest in Jerusalem by Claudius Lysias, the Roman tribune. It was the false and twisted accusations of the Jews which, due in part to their jealousy of Paul's Gentile ministry, kept Paul in Roman custody. However, that which the author of Acts is now saying in this section is that there were others who bore Christian witness to

Gentiles before Paul. Philip and Peter himself had witnessed to Gentiles even before Paul and they had not been punished for it. Yet Paul is being held prisoner for something which has not been considered a crime until now.

This brings us very naturally to the final section of Acts, "The Passion of Paul." We turn now to discover the remarkable parallel between the "Passion of Paul" in Acts with the"Passion of Jesus" in the Third Gospel. It is here that Luke defends Paul the prisoner.

CHAPTER IV

JESUS-PAUL PARALLELS--IN DEFENSE OF PAUL THE PRISONER

Martin Dibelius remarked that it is strange that the great problem presented by the hearings of Paul at Jerusalem and Caesarea "is so little in evidence in commentaries and critical research."[1] Indeed, it is surprising to find not one published scholarly work which could be called a direct and exclusive treatment of the Pauline hearings narratives.[2]

However, if we assume, as we must, that the way a writer concludes his book is significant, and that the amount of space he allots to a particular section is important, then this long section leading up to the conclusion of Acts, as we have it, deserves more attention than it has

---

[1]Martin Dibelius, "Paul in the Acts of the Apostles," in Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, p. 211.

[2]Dibelius himself has devoted some excellent paragraphs to these narratives in the course of his treatment of broader subjects: "Paul in the Acts of the Apostles," in Studies, pp. 211-213; and "The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles," Studies, pp. 149, 170-74. The same is true for H. J. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts, pp. 310-316.

received. These hearings dominate more than one-fourth of Acts,[3] more than all the rest of Paul's speeches. Indeed the final journey of Paul to Jerusalem and Rome, which provides the setting for these hearings, takes up more space in Acts than does all the other travel and work of Paul combined. As Floyd V. Filson has said:

> On the ground of space used it might even seem . . . that this final journey was more important to Luke than was all of Paul's mission preaching.[4]

What is one to make of so much space being allotted to the hearings of Paul? Does it perhaps have something to do with the purpose of Luke in writing Acts? Could it give us important insight into the difficult question of the date of Acts? Will a study of this particular section give us some understanding of the composition of Acts?

There are many speeches[5] and many trials[6] in Acts. However, a hearing is a special kind of speech and trial which is substantially different from these. The broadest

---

[3]From Paul's arrest in 21:33, Acts relates his experiences under different Roman officials, but he is always in custody and defending himself.

[4]F. V. Filson, Three Crucial Decades, p. 14.

[5]1:15-22; 2:14-36; 3:12-26; 4:8-12; 5:35-39; 7:2-52; 10:34-43; 11:4-17; 13:2; 13:16-47; 14:15-17; 15:7-11; 15:13-21; 17:22-31; 20:18-35; 22:1-21; 23:1-6; 24:2-8; 24:10-21; 26:1-23; 27:21-26; 28:17-20, 25-28.

[6]4:1-22; 5:17-42; 6:12-7:60; 16:19-24;35-40; 17:6-9; 18:12-17; 22:30-23;10; 24:1-23; 25:1-12; 25:23-26:32. To these might be added two mob scenes: 19:23-41; 21:27-22:29 and four deliberative investigations: 11:1-18; 15:1-29; 17:16-34; 28:17-28.

definition of a hearing and one which will not in any way, I think, prejudge the materials at our disposal is: A narrative in which Paul is in Roman custody and makes an apology for the benefit of a Roman officer, of which we have either the whole or a part surviving in the book of Acts. The fitness of this definition finds some support in the fact that the word ἀπολογία or ἀπολογέομαι is itself used to designate the speeches which Paul made before the rioting Jews in Jerusalem (22:1); before Felix (24:10); before Festus (25:8, 16); and before Agrippa (26:2,24). This term is not used of the speeches made by Paul the prisoner before the Sanhedrin (22:30-23:10), nor of that before Felix and Drusilla (24:24-27). It is however used in 19:33 where Alexander the Jew wishes to make a defense before the Ephesians but is prohibited. Outside of these references, the term does not appear in any of its forms in Acts.

However, while the word ἀπολογία or ἀπολογέομαι does support our definition as far as it goes, it does not go far enough. There are, I believe, "genuine" hearings of Paul in Acts which are not designated by the word. Therefore, in order to include all of these hearings, we must isolate the genuine hearings of Paul by other means.

Dibelius isolates five hearings of Paul.[7] He does not take into account the defense before the Jerusalem

---

[7]"Paul in the Acts of the Apostles," in Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, p. 212.

rioters (27:1-21) in spite of the fact that the word ἀπολογία is used to designate it by Luke. This is no doubt due to the fact that the defense is not given primarily for the benefit of a Roman governmental official, but for that of the Jews themselves. In this omission we concur.[8]

The five "hearings" which Dibelius isolates shall constitute the starting point for our own study. It remains for us now to provide (1) A summary of the contents of these hearings; (2) An analysis of these hearings; (3) Preliminary conclusions regarding these hearings.

A. A Brief Summary of the Contents of the Hearings of Paul in Acts.

1. Before the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem (22:30-23:10)

The tribune brings Paul before the Sanhedrin in order that he (Lysias) might "know the real reason why the Jews accused him." Paul's defense consists of two elements: (a) declaration that he is an obedient Jew (23:1-5, 6b); (b) mention of the resurrection (6b). This defense is followed by Pharisaic acquittal (9b).[9]

---

[8]Here is a brief summary of the contents of this hearing: Paul addresses the rioting mob in their native tongue (22:1-2). His defense consists of his heritage and upbringing (vv. 3-4), his conversion (vv. 5-16), and his commission to the Gentiles (vv. 17-21). The "defense" is followed by violent Jewish rejection and subsequent Roman imprisonment (vv. 22-24ff.).

[9]To call the response of the Pharisees who sat upon the Sanhedrin a "verdict of acquittal" is not to stretch the case. Cadbury, "Roman Law and the Trial of Paul," in Beginnings, Vol. 5, pp. 302-304, has shown that it might

2. Before Felix at Caesarea (24:10-23)

Tertullus accuses Paul. Paul's defense consists of (a) declaration that he is an obedient Jew, and that he instigated no rebellion either in temple, synagogues, or Jerusalem anywhere (vv. 11b-12); (b) mention of resurrection, and that he is a member of the sect called the "Way" which believes in resurrection (vv. 14-15, 21). This defense is also followed by action resembling acquittal.[10]

---

indeed be that the Sanhedrin had the power to pass such a verdict in Paul's case, despite the opposite about two decades earlier in the case of Jesus. However, this is not the question at all. Luke is not concerned with introducing the reader to the legal situation and niceties of the trial of Paul. Cadbury says on p. 298, "Although the author, among many other claims for him, has been attributed a considerable legal interest and even legal knowledge (D. Plooij, Expositor, Dec., 1914, pp. 511ff., Feb. 1917, pp. 108ff.; J. I. Still, St. Paul on Trial, 1924), the narrative in Acts is an untechnical account with apologetic motive." Why is it that Luke felt it important to have the Pharisees exonerate Paul? Dibelius, "The Speeches in Acts," in Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, p. 170, says"". . . Paul, instead of speaking of the accusation against his own person, makes belief in the resurrection the central point in this discussion; the Pharisees take up this theme and declare Paul innocent: all this is very dubious. But Luke suggests no other motivation for the scene; obviously he simply wishes to emphasize the fact that the Pharisees had to make what was really a conditional acknowledgment of Christianity, with its belief in the resurrection."

[10]To say that 24:22-23 constitute acquittal may seem to be something of an overstatement. However, that this was Luke's intention in these verses seems clear when one recalls that as the spokesman of the Jews, Tertullus made his accusation, "The Jews also joined in the charge, affirming that all this was so." (9) In the light of this verse, the statement in verse twenty-two that Felix put them off becomes clear. The "them" is obviously the clamoring Jews led by Tertullus who desire Paul's execution. Felix both puts them off and places Paul in protective custody, allowing him an extreme amount of freedom. (See Ernst Haenchen, Die Apostelgeschichte, p. 589, n.1, on custodia libera.)

3. Before Felix and Drusilla at Caesarea (24:24-27)

Paul is placed before Felix and Drusilla, his wife, a Jewess. His "defense" consists of speaking of faith in Jesus Christ, justice, self-control, and future judgment (vv. 24b-25). The remainder of the passage includes the following: Felix is alarmed (25b); he hoped for money (26a); he sent for Paul often to converse with him (26b); when he was succeeded by Festus he left Paul in prison "desiring to do the Jews a favor" (27).[11]

4. Before Festus at Caesarea (25:6-12)

A deputation from Jerusalem accuses Paul. Paul's "defense" consists of his claims that he has committed

---

[11]It is notable that there is no actual "speech" as such in this hearing account. There is only an indirect summary of that which comprised Paul's conversation with Felix and Drusilla. Therefore, it is impossible to call it a "hearing" of Paul, since there is no real defense or apology for christianity offered. Although this will be discussed in detail in the next section of the paper, it should be said that to call this "abstract discussion" as does J. Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, 1944, p. 406, is certainly going too far. Paul's choice audience had probably never been so directly encountered with practical issues on the basis of a way of life before. Now, after speaking of faith in Jesus, Paul deals boldly with the very subjects this royal couple needed to hear. Drusilla was less than twenty years of age at this time and the youngest daughter of Herod Agrippa I. She had been betrothed to the crown prince of Commagene, in eastern Asia Minor, as a small girl, but the marriage was not consummated because the prospective bridegroom refused to embrace Judaism. She was later married to the king of Emesa, a petty state in Syria (modern Homs). Then, at the age of sixteen she was persuaded to leave her husband by Felix (with the help of a Cypriote magician called Atomos). Thus, she became Felix's third wife, and bore his son Agrippa, who died in the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 A. D. (See Josephus, Antiquities XIX 9:1; XX:7:1f.)

no offense against the law, the temple, or Caesar (8). The remainder of the passage includes the following: Festus, to please the Jews, shows his intention to try Paul at Jerusalem (9);[12] Paul promptly appeals to Caesar (vv. 10-11);[13] Festus grants his appeal (12).[14]

---

[12]That Festus wanted to do the Jews a favor by trying Paul in Jerusalem has often been the basis of accusation against his moral stature. However, Cadbury argues, "Roman Law and the Trial of Paul," in Beginnings, Vol. V, p. 308, especially n. 5, that it was natural for Festus, being a new procurator and unfamiliar with Paul's case, to want to try it in Jerusalem where Lysias, the arresting officer, and the full story of the proceedings would be available to him more easily. He wanted to know the facts before he rendered judgment (cf. 25:20). Also see G. H. C. Macgregor, The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. IX, pp. 314, 315, 318. But especially see A. N. Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament, p. 67, "Festus could not hand over his capital jurisdiction, either in earlier or in later usage, to a provincial tribunal such as the Sanhedrin, or to any third party. But nothing prevented him from using the Sanhedrin, or members of it, as his own consilium. That is what Paul feared. To avoid it he invoked the right of trial before a court at Rome."

[13]There is a question whether Paul's appeal was actually to Caesar himself or merely to Festus as "Caesar's tribunal." Cadbury, "The Appeal to Caesar," in Beginnings, Vol. V, p. 318, says that it is "not an appeal against the jurisdiction of the procurator, but against the Jewish court to whom Festus threatened to expose Paul. He insists on a Roman trial." However, Sherwin-White calls this proposition of Cadbury "absurd." (See Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament, op. cit., p. 66.) At any rate, Festus is portrayed by Luke as understanding it as a formal appeal, and therefore binds Paul over to be sent to Rome.

[14]It is immediately clear that in this passage, as in the preceding one, identified by Dibelius as a "hearing of Paul," we do not find an actual apology for Paul's faith. It is true that here he does deny any offense against either Judaism or Roman Law, but, beyond this, there is no further apologetic emphasis in the entire passage.

5. Before Herod Agrippa II at Caesarea (26:1-32)

Herod grants Paul permission to speak before himself, Bernice, and Festus. Paul's defense consists of: Declaration that he is a faithful Jew--a Pharisee (26:5-8); Mention of the resurrection (vv. 9, 23); a report of his conversion (vv. 9-23); Agrippa's "acquittal" (vv. 30-32).

B. An Analysis of the Hearings of Paul in Acts.

1. Those before the Sanhedrin, before Felix, and before Agrippa.

It will readily appear from the foregoing summaries of the hearings of Paul that the content of three of his trial speeches, those before the Sanhedrin, Felix, and Agrippa, is strikingly similar while that of the other two, those before Felix and Drusilla, and before Festus is quite different. This similarity of the three speeches suggests that here we are perhaps face to face with a genuine trial speech formula used by Luke.

There are three basic elements which are characteristic of these three speeches as Luke records them. First, there is a declaration of loyalty to Judaism; second, there is a testimony to the resurrection which is always attached immediately to the former declaration; third, there is a verdict, expressed or implied, of "not guilty" which always follows the speech. From this formula there is absolutely no deviation.

a. Declaration of loyalty to Judaism linked with

a testimony to the Resurrection.

1) The Sanhedrin Hearing--23:6b: "Brethren, I am a Pharisee, a son of Pharisees; with respect to the hope and the resurrection of the dead I am on trial."

2) The Felix Hearing--24:14-15: "But this I admit to you, that according to the Way, which they call a sect, I worship the God of our fathers, believing everything laid down by the law or written in the prophets, having a hope in God which these themselves accept, that there will be a resurrection of both the just and the unjust."

3) The Agrippa Hearing--26:5b-8: " . . . according to the strictest party of our religion I have lived as a Pharisee. And now I stand here on trial for hope in the promise made by God to our fathers. . . . And for this hope I am accused by Jews, O King! Why is it thought incredible by any of you that God raises the dead?"

b. Verdict of "not guilty" by the authority representing Rome.

1) The Sanhedrin Hearing--23:9: " . . . some of the scribes of the Pharisees' party stood up and contended, 'We find nothing wrong in this man.'" 23:29: (Claudius Lysias writes a letter to Felix, the governor) "I found that he was accused about questions of their law, but charged with nothing deserving death or imprisonment."

2) The Felix Hearing--24:22-23: "But Felix, having a rather accurate knowledge of the Way, put them

off, saying, 'When Lysias the tribune comes down, I will decide your case.' Then he gave orders to the centurion that he should be kept in custody but should have some liberty, and that none of his friends should be prevented from attending to his needs." Later he saw Paul again, this time with his wife Drusilla who was a Jewess (25:24). On this occasion Felix was alarmed by Paul's reasoning regarding justice, temperance and future judgment. In the verses which follow we are given to believe that Felix sent for Paul often. At the same time he hoped for a bribe from Paul.[15] It was only in order to gain favor with the Jews who lodged an indictment against him for his behavior when he intervened in the riots between the Jewish and Gentile citizens of Caesarea, that he left Paul in custody and did not free him when he vacated his office (v. 27).

3) The Agrippa Hearing--26:31b-32: "'This man is doing nothing deserving death or imprisonment.' And Agrippa said to Festus, 'This man could have been set free if he had not appealed to Caesar.'"

2. Those Before Felix-Drusilla and Before Festus

What of the two hearings which remain? What can be said of their characteristic elements? In what ways do

---

[15]Cf. F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 428, "The taking of bribes was forbidden by the lex Iulia de repetundis, which was, however, more often than not violated by governors. The procurator, Albimus, was an outstanding example of venality (cf. Jos. BJ, ii. 14.I; Antiq. XX, 9.5). Cf. the δ addition between 23:24 and 25."

they differ from these three?

a. The hearing before Felix and Drusilla--24:24-27

Acts 24:24-27 possesses none of the three outstanding elements of the three longer trial speeches of Paul dealt with above. It adds nothing to the content of the first hearing before Felix except the clause διαλεγομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἐγκρατείας καὶ τοῦ κρίματος τοῦ μέλλοντος.

The difference between this hearing and the others is evident in that Luke says that Paul spoke "upon faith in Christ Jesus . . . and argued about justice and self-control and future judgment," none of which appears in the other three. Neither is there an interest on the part of the author to secure a verdict of "not guilty" as there is in the others.

How are we to explain these differences? What is accomplished in the author's use of this hearing? Whence came the particular ingredients for this hearing? J. C. O'Neill informs us that

> this type of apologetic, where moral virtues are pressed on the hearers with urgency because the judgment is coming, is naturally found in Hellenistic Jewish missionary literature.[16]

He continues, "These two particular virtues are, however, not the obvious ones to choose, either separately or in

---

[16]J. C. O'Neill, The Theology of Acts, p. 164. Several examples given are: Wisdom of Solomon 6:1-9; Sibylline Oracles 4:163-178.

combination."[17] It is significant, then, to discover that they occur together in two apologetic books of Diaspora Judaism, Epistles of Aristeas 277 and Philo's De virtutibus 180.

In the former Pharaoh asked why the majority of men did not become virtuous. The answer which one of the Jewish translators gave concluded: "The habit of virtue is a hindrance to those who are devoted to a life of pleasure because it enjoins upon them the preference of temperance and righteousness."[18] The same combination of righteousness and temperance appears in Philo, who says that the repentant man must turn from vice to virtue: "This means passing from ignorance to knowledge of things which it is disgraceful not to know, from senselessness to good sense, from incontinence to continence, from injustice (ἀδικίας) to justice (δικαιοσυνης), from timidity to boldness."[19]

These references seem to indicate, though they do not prove conclusively, that the summary of Paul's preaching given in this so-called "hearing" before Felix and Drusilla is a typical approach to Gentiles which was made

---

[17]Cf. O'Neill, ibid., n. 1, "ἐγκράτεια" is not precise enough to provide a reference to Felix's sexual irregularities; Beginnings IV, 305."

[18]Text translated by H. T. Andrews in R. H. Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913, Vol. 2, p. 118.

[19]Text translated by F. H. Colson, Loeb Library, Vol. 8, 1939.

by Jews of the Dispersion and which Luke took over and put into the mouth of Paul. The evidence is admittedly scant, but it is possible that the two virtues of temperance and righteousness were combined in Jewish missionary preaching with a warning about God's impending judgment in order to produce either repentance or godly confidence within the hearers.

This would explain the presence at this point of this "unkerygmatic" speech, so unlike the first three discussed. It is taken over by Luke from the popular preaching of his day, not to add anything to the nature of Paul's defense, but to "further the action" within the overall narrative.[20] That is, Luke uses it here to explain the movement from Felix to Festus and to place the embarrassing two years imprisonment of Paul in as favorable a light as possible. And Luke succeeds. The effect is achieved of blaming the long detention of Paul upon the Jews ("and desiring to do the Jews a favor, Felix left Paul in prison" 24:27), and Felix is even said to have sent for Paul "often and conversed with him" (vs. 26). Thus, Paul the prisoner becomes Paul the spiritual adviser to his captor! The time lapse is further bridged by bringing Festus into the picture at this point and leading naturally to the "hearing"

---

[20]Dibelius, "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historigraphy," in Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, p. 140.

before him.

b. The hearing before Festus--25:8-12

This passage can also be said to possess none of the three outstanding elements of the three longer hearings of Paul. Indeed, the entire content of the Festus speech consists of a cryptic reply of Paul similar to the one made to Felix and Drusilla: οὔτε εἰς τὸν νόμον τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὔτε εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν οὔτε εἰς καίσαρα τι ἥμαρτον.

A comparison of this reply with that in 24:12 shows no difference except that "in the city" is interpreted here as "against Caesar." The embarrassing two years of Paul's imprisonment are now finally bridged and the appeal to Caesar is explained in terms which place Paul in a good light with the authorities.

Thus, instead of Paul's appeal being due to his fear of conviction by Roman law in a lower court, the same appeal becomes Paul's proud weapon which he uses precisely because of his good faith in Roman law and his fear of being turned over to the Jews who would not have been completely fair, as Rome certainly would.

Again, as with the Felix and Drusilla hearing, we have a story incorporated by Luke, this time not from popular Jewish usage or from Hellenistic Jewish missionary literature, but from a previous hearing of Paul, that before Felix (in 24:10-23). Again the purpose of this "hearing" is to effect the movement from the genuine hearing

before Felix to that before Agrippa in such a way that Paul's position before the Roman authorities would not be unfavorable.

C. Preliminary Conclusions Regarding the Hearings

1. Not Five Hearings but Three

Both the summary of the contents and the analysis of the basic elements of the so-called hearings of Paul disclose that we have not five but three hearings and two adaptations of Luke, one from the popular preaching of his day as it is found also in current Hellenistic Jewish missionary literature, and one from the Felix hearing. These two are added to effect the movement from Felix to Festus to Agrippa, and to account for the embarrassing two years imprisonment of the hero Paul in as noble a manner as possible, thereby making him to appear in a favorable light with the Roman authorities.

2. Similarity of the Basic Elements within the Hearings

Both in form and content the three basic elements of the hearings are virtually identical: (1) declaration of loyalty to Judaism; (2) testimony to the Resurrection; followed by (3) a verdict, expressed or implied, by the representative of the Roman authority, of "not guilty". These elements, always in this same order, are consistently present.

D. A Comparison of the Hearings of Paul in Acts and the Hearings of Jesus in Luke

It is generally held by all but the most conservative scholars[21] that the hearings-narratives as they stand in Acts are the creations of Luke. Cadbury, for example, has said that the language and style of all the speeches in Acts, including the speeches made while Paul was on trial before Roman authorities, are not that of Paul, Peter, Stephen and others, but rather of Luke. He says, "This argues their common origin in the mind of the author."[22]

Dibelius, in speaking specifically about the speeches delivered by Paul while he was a prisoner, also gives evidence of his belief that they are constructions of Luke. He says of them: "These speeches without doubt are as they stand, inventions of the author."[23] Again:

> The speeches are thus really intended for the reader. We cannot know what accounts Luke had and applied in this part of his book, for, as they lie before us, the chapters in question are those marked by his own literary treatment.[24]

---

[21]E.g., W. M. Ramsay, F. F. Bruce. For example, see F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, pp. 18-21.

[22]Cadbury, "The Speeches in Acts," p. 407.

[23]Dibelius, A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature, p. 262.

[24]Dibelius, "Style Criticism of the Book of Acts," p. 7. See also "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography," p. 149; and "The First Christian Historian," p. 134: "What he (Luke) is concerned with (in these speeches) is to express, clearly and repeatedly, the themes of Christian preaching. The mission to the Gentiles is a

Dibelius further points out that the speeches of Paul in these hearings do not even answer the accusations with which Paul is charged, and, from this, he argues that it is Luke's intention to instruct his own Christian readers in the art of apologetics by giving them examples of how Paul would do it.[25]

Finally, Haenchen, in speaking of the speech before Felix, says that it is not the problems of Paul's day which the speeches answer, but primarily those of Luke's day. They serve to show the connection of Christianity with the best of Judaism.

> Paulus verteidigt sich gegen Vorwürfe, die gegen ihn erhoben werden; aber im Grunde spricht er gar nicht von einer damals schon überholten Vergangenheit--der Tempel lag längst in Trümmern, als Lukas die Apg schreib--, sondern von der für Lukas und die Christen seiner Zeit brennenden frage; lässt sich das Christentum in ungebrochener Kontinuität mit dem Judentum verstehen?[26]

However, if we say that these are largely the constructions of Luke, we should seek to find some pattern for such a construction. We have this pattern, Cadbury believes

---

divine, rather than human, activity, and it is in the Christian message that Jewish hopes find fulfillment; this is shown in these speeches and trials particularly by the belief in the resurrection. These are ideas which enjoyed a special hearing in Luke's day, in the decades when the Church was visibly detaching herself from Judaism. In these chapters, then, Luke wishes to present first of all not what has taken place but what is taking place."

[25]Dibelius, "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography," p. 149.

[26]E. Haenchen, Die Apostelgeschichte, p. 560.

in Luke's own similar record of the trials of Jesus.[27] Indeed, in the Lukan record, the final experiences of Paul during his journey to Rome resemble the final journey of Jesus to Jerusalem so strikingly that it is hard to resist the idea that Luke saw these events as elements of Paul's "Passion," and consciously strove to record them with Jesus' earlier passion as his model.

The purpose of such conscious following of a pattern is to be found in the author's desire to demonstrate the innocence of Paul to the readers of Acts. The details of Jesus' trial and subsequent condemnation were well known to all Christians and to many others who were not Christians (cf. Acts 26:26). Jesus' execution was, in the opinion of all Christians, one of the greatest atrocities of justice ever perpetrated by Roman authority. Jesus was innocent of any crime against Rome; he had been declared innocent by several Roman authorities. However, he was executed by Roman law in order to please the angry, insistent Jews. And now a similar atrocity is about to be perpetrated by Rome again, this time upon the person of Paul. Paul is also innocent just as Jesus had been innocent; he has been tried and "acquitted" (found "not guilty") by the same three-fold Roman authority as Jesus. However, in spite of this, he too stood in danger of losing his very

---

[27]Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts, p. 310.

life in Rome. The author of Acts points up the irony of Paul's precarious position, and desperately tries through this parallelism to awaken his readers to Paul's danger in an attempt to save him from impending execution.

The two sets of hearings are similar in (1) Addressee, (2) Linguistic formulation of charges and verdicts.

It remains here to (A) demonstrate the literary relationship between the hearings of Paul in Acts and the hearings of Jesus in Luke, and then (B) show that this literary relationship with Acts is peculiar to the Gospel of Luke, and not influenced by Mark or Matthew, and that this material is concerned exclusively with the formulation of accusation and verdict in Jesus' trials. Only then may we draw any sound conclusions regarding this relationship.

(A) The Literary Relationship Between the Hearings of Paul in Acts and the Hearings of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke

The two sets of hearings are especially similar in addressee and linguistic formulation of charges and verdicts.

(1) Similarity of Addressee

Jesus is first tried by the Jerusalem Council (Lk. 22:66-71--"Elders of the people . . . chief priests and scribes"); then by Pilate, the Roman procurator (Lk. 23:1-5); and finally by Herod Antipas, king of the Jews (Lk. 23:6-11). It is without further trial, according to Luke,

that Pilate condemns Jesus at the Jews' insistence. Paul also was first tried by the Jerusalem council (Acts 22:30-23:10); then by Felix, the Roman procurator who occupied Pilate's former office (Acts 24:1-27);[28] and finally by Herod Agrippa II, the king of the Jews, who occupied the former office of Herod Antipas (Acts 26:1-32).

That this succession of developments in the trial of Jesus is different from that in Mark and "Q" is evident from the fact that in Mark, Jesus is examined only twice: first by the Sanhedrin (14:55-65) and then by Pilate (15:2-15). Thus, there is no trial before the king of the Jews corresponding to that in Luke. In Matthew also Jesus is tried only twice: first by the Sanhedrin(26:59-68) and then by Pilate (27:11-26). Again, there is no trial before Herod corresponding to that in the Gospel of Luke. It is only in Luke's Gospel that we have this exact correspondence with the trials of Paul in Acts. Indeed, as we hope to demonstrate below, it is only in the Gospel material unique to Luke and not influenced by Mark or "Q" that the correspondence to Acts appears.

---

[28]Here the problem of Drusilla (24:24-27) and Festus (25:8-12) comes in. If, however, Luke was consciously accommodating his record of Paul's hearings to that of Jesus in the third Gospel, our proposal that the accounts of trial before Felix and Drusilla and before Festus are adaptations of Luke from Jewish missionary literature or from an earlier trial of Paul with the motive of explaining Paul's long imprisonment with a minimum of embarrassment to the apostle is strengthened (supra pp. 70-71).

(2) Similarity of Linguistic Formulation of Charges and Verdicts

Not only is there a remarkable similarity of addressee between the two sets of hearings, there is an equally remarkable similarity of language itself.[29]

a. Charges

In both the Gospel and the Acts the charges against the two heroes, Jesus and Paul, are formulated in political terms. In the Gospel this formulation stands in distinction to the formulation of charges against Jesus in Matthew and Mark.[30]

Against Jesus

Luke 23:2--"And they began to accuse him, saying, 'We found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding us

---

[29]H. J. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts, p. 310.

[30]Charges against Jesus in Mark 14:58 , 63-64--Before the High Priest: "We heard him say, 'I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another, not made with hands.' . . . And the high priest tore his mantle, and said, 'Why do we still need witnesses? You have heard his blasphemy. What is your decision?'" Mark 15:2,4--Before Pilate: "And Pilate asked him, 'Are you the King of the Jews?' . . . And the chief priests accused him of many things. And Pilate again asked him, 'Have you no answer to make? See how many charges they bring against you.'" Matthew 26:61, 65-66--Before the Sanhedrin: "This fellow said, 'I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days.' . . . 'He has uttered blasphemy. Why do we still need witnesses? You have now heard his blasphemy. What is your judgment?'" Matthew 27:11-13--Before Pilate: " . . . the governor asked him, 'Are you the King of the Jews?' . . . he was accused by the chief priests and elders, . . . Then Pilate said to him, 'Do you not hear how many things they testify against you?'"

to give tribute to Caesar, and saying that he himself is Christ a King.'"

Luke 23:5--"He stirs up the people . . . "

Luke 23:14--" . . . perverting the people . . ."

Against Paul

Acts 24:5-6--"We have found this man a pestilent fellow, an agitator among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes. He even tried to profane the Temple but we seized him."

In these verses we have a threefold indictment almost identical with that of Jesus in the third Gospel. In the words of F. F. Bruce:

> Here the accusation is that Paul is (1) a troublesome pest, (2) a ringleader of the Nazarenes, (3) a desecrator of the Temple. The first charge put him in the same category as many who stirred up strife about that time; the second associated him with a Messianic movement . . . the third marked him as an opponent of the established order . . .[31]

b. Verdicts

The legal term αἴτιον is characteristic of both sets of verdicts,[32] as is is some variation of the phrase οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου.[33]

---

[31]F. F, Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, pp.421-22.

[32]The term is often used in antiquity: charge of complaint--Mk. 15:26; Mt. 27:37; John 18:38; 19:4,6; accusation--Jos. Ant. 20:47; to accuse: (αἰτιάομαι)--Philo Decal. 87; Jos. Ant. 14:44; 15:31; LXX.

[33]In addition to the passages cited here, this phrase appears with this same sense of acquittal in Plut. Marcus Cato 21, p. 349a; Hyperid. 3:14; Jos. Ant. 11:144;

For Jesus[34]

Luke 23:4--"I find no fault (αἴτιον) in this man."

Luke 23:14-16--" . . . I did not find this man guilty of any of your charges (αἰτίον) against him . . . nothing deserving of death has been done by him" (οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου εστιν πεπραγμένου αὐτῷ).

Luke 23:22--" . . . I have found in him no crime (αἴτιον) deserving death . . . "

For Paul

Acts 23:28-29--"And desiring to know the charge (αἰτίον) . . . nothing deserving death or imprisonment" (μηδὲν δὲ ἄξιον θανάτου ἢ δεσμῶν).

Acts 25:18--" . . . they brought no charges (αἰτία) in his case of such evils as I supposed . . . "

Acts 25:25--" . . . He had done nothing deserving death (μηδὲν ἄξιον αὐτὸν θανάτου πεπραχέναι).

Hum. Wr. 1:20. See further J. A. Kleist, "'αξιος' in the Gospels," CBQ 6, 1944, pp. 342-6; K. Stendahl, Nuntius 7, 1952, pp. 53-4.

[34]Verdicts for Jesus in: Mark 14:64--By the Sanhedrin: "They all condemned him as deserving death." Mark 15:14-15--By Pilate: "And Pilate said to them, 'Why, what evil has he done?' But they shouted all the more, 'Crucify him.' So Pilate, wishing to satisfy the crowd, released for them Barabbas; and having scourged Jesus, he delivered him to be crucified." Matthew 26:66--By the Sanhedrin: "They answered, 'He deserves death.'" Matthew 27:23-24--By Pilate: "And he said, 'Why, what evil has he done?' But they shouted all the more, "Let him be crucified.' So when Pilate saw that he was gaining nothing, but rather that a riot was beginning, he took water and washed his hands before the crowd, saying, 'I am innocent of this man's blood; see to it yourselves.'"

Acts 26:31--"This man is doing nothing to deserve death or imprisonment" (οὐδὲν θανάτου ἢ δεσμῶν ἄξιον πράσσει ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος).

(B) This Relationship is Peculiar to the Non-Markan and Non-"Q" Material in the Gospel of Luke, and is concerned only with the Formulation of Accusation and Verdict in Jesus' Trial.

While the record of the hearings of Paul appears in Acts 23:1-26:32, that of the hearings of Jesus is found in Luke 22:66-23:25; Mark 14:53-15:15; and Matthew 26:57-27:26. The following will indicate materials in Luke which are either absent or substantially[35] different from those in either Mark or "Q", and show that these materials are concerned only with the formulation of accusation and verdict in Jesus' trial.

(1) Materials in Luke Which are Either Absent or Substantially Different from Those in Mark or "Q."

23:2 And they began to accuse him, saying, "We found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding us to give tribute to Caesar, and saying that he himself is Christ a king."

23:4-5 And Pilate said to the chief priests and the multitudes, "I find no crime in this man." But they were urgent, saying, "He stirs up the people, teaching throughout all Judea, from Galilee even to this place."

23:6-16 When Pilate heard this, he asked whether

---

[35]By substantially we mean that something is added to or is significantly altered in the narrative from the way it appears in Mark or Matthew.

the man were a Galilean. And when he learned that he belonged to Herod's jurisdiction, he sent him over to Herod, who was himself in Jerusalem at that time. When Herod saw Jesus, he was very glad, for he had long desired to see him, because he had heard about him, and he was hoping to see some sign done by him. So he questioned him at some length; but he made no answer. The chief priests and the scribes stood by, vehemently accusing him. And Herod with his soldiers treated him with contempt and mocked him; then, arraying him in gorgeous apparel, he sent him back to Pilate. And Herod and Pilate became friends with each other that very day, for before this they had been at enmity with each other. Pilate then called together the chief priests and the rulers and the people, and said to them, "You brought me this man as one who was perverting the people; and after examining him before you, behold, I did not find this man guilty of any of your charges against him; neither did Herod, for he sent him back to us. Behold, nothing deserving death has been done by him; I will therefore chastise him and release him."

23:22 " . . . I have found in him no crime deserving death; I will therefore chastise him and release him."

23:27-32 And there followed him a great multitude of the people, and of women who bewailed and lamented him. But Jesus turning to them said, "Daughters of Jerusalem, do not weep for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children. For behold, the days are coming when they will say, 'Blessed are the barren, and the wombs that never bore, and the breasts that never gave suck!' Then they will begin to say to the mountains, 'Fall on us'; and to the hills, 'Cover us.' For if they do this when the wood is green, what will happen when it is dry?"

23:34 And Jesus said, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do."

23:39-43[36] One of the criminals who were hanged

---

[36]Cf. Mk. 15:32 and Mt. 27:44 which merely note that those who were crucified with him reviled him.

> railed at him, saying, "Are you not the Christ? Save thyself and us!" But the other rebuked him, saying, "Do you not fear God, since you are under the same sentence of condemnation? And we indeed justly; for we are receiving the due reward of our deeds; but this man has done nothing wrong." And he said, "Jesus, remember me when you come in your kingly power." And he said to him, "Truly, I say to you, today you will be with me in Paradise."
>
> 23:47[37] Now when the centurion saw what had taken place, he praised God, and said, "Certainly this man was innocent!"
>
> 23:48 And all the multitudes who assembled to see the sight, when they saw what had taken place, returned home beating their breasts.

(2) These Materials are Concerned Only With the Formulation of Accusation and Verdict in Jesus' Trial.

Luke is remarkable in that the full formulation of the charges, and acquittal, are all technically correct.[38]

(a) Luke 23:2

ἤρξαντο δὲ κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ λέγοντες τοῦτον ἐνραμεν διαστρέφοντα τὸ ἔθνος ἡμῶν καὶ κωλύοντα φόρους καίσαρι διδόναι καὶ λέγοντα εαυτόν χριστὸν βασιλέα εἶναι

Here we have three specific political charges: (1) seditious agitation--διαστρέφοντα τὸ ἔθνος ἡμῶν, (2) forbidding tribute to Caesar--κωλύοντα φόρους καίσαρι διδόναι, (3) assuming the title of king--λέγοντα εαυτόν χριστὸν βασιλέα εἶναι. All of these are treasonable actions

---

[37] Cf. Mk. 15:39 and Mt. 27:54 which say that the centurion exclaimed, "Truly this was a son of God."

[38] A. N. Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law, p. 32.

punishable by death under what was known as the Roman cognitio, the criminal trial by a provincial governor. There is no formal description of such criminal trials by provincial governors between the brief evidence of Cicero's Verrines and that of Pliny's Letters from Bithynia-Pontus, including the account of the trial of the Christians, in about 110 A. D. However, from the evidence of the classical lawyers and of the imperial rescripts in the Digesta iuris Romani in Corpus Iuris Civilis, an account can be constructed of the developed form of cognitio in the late second and early third centuries. The standard exposition of this procedure is to be found in Mommsen's Strafrecht with modern amendments.[39] Of this very explicit accusation in Luke, Sherwin-White comments, "This fits very well the workings of cognitio."[40] Thus, Luke's addition in 23:2, unlike anything in Mark or "Q", but resembling closely the accusation against Paul in Acts, concerns the political formulation of charges against Jesus.

(b) Luke 23:4-5

ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος εἶπεν πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ τοὺς ὄχλους οὐδὲν εὑρίσκω αἴτιον ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ. οἱ δὲ ἐπίσχυον λέγοντες ὅτι ἀνασείει τὸν λαόν, διδάσκων καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας, καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἕως ὧδε.

Here in v 4 there is a "verdict" of Pilate: "I

---

[39]For the bulk of this paragraph I am indebted to A. N. Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law, p. 13.

[40]Ibid., p. 25.

find no crime in this man" (οὐδὲν εὑρίσκω αἴτιον ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπω τούτω). Αἴτιον = αἰτία and derivatives is often used by Luke and is usually combined with a negative. It appears again in 23:14, 22 and in Acts 13:28; 19:40; 23:28; 25:18, 27; 28:18. It means "reason," "charge" or "crime" and is a political or legal term.[41]

There is also a counter accusation by the chief priest and the people: "he stirs up the people" (ἀνασείει τὸν λαόν). This is almost the same as that in 23:2 of seditious agitation (cf. Acts 24:5, 6). However, it does not carry the idea of seditiousness quite as strongly. It has more of the meaning "to incite to riot."

(c) Luke 23:6-16

This is the trial before Herod which is peculiar to Luke's Gospel. There is no formal formulation of accusation or verdict by Herod himself or by anyone involved in the trial of Jesus before him. The recording of the mere fact of the trial and the implication of a verdict of 'not guilty' by Herod without any real results of the trial seems to be the purpose of Luke in these verses. The formulation of accusation and verdict in this passage again comes from Pilate:

> προσηνέγκατέ μοι τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον ὡς ἀποστρέφοντα τὸν λαόν, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν ἀνακρίνας οὐθὲν εὗρον ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπω τούτω αἴτιον ὧν κατηγορεῖτε καί

---

[41]Cf. Arndt-Gingrich's translation of Walter Bauer's A Greek-English Lexicon for αἰτίον as a legal term.

αὐτοῦ. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Ἡρῴδης ἀνέ πεμψεν γὰρ αὐτὸν προς ἡμᾶς καὶ ἰδου οὐδὲν ἄξιον θὰνάτου ἐστὶν πεπραγμενον αὐτῷ.

"Perverting the people" (ἀποστρέφοντα τὸν Λαόν) is the charge here. It is the same basic accusation found in 23:2 and means seducing the people from their allegiance (to Rome). In this passage Luke manages to condense the three charges in 23:2 to one. The emphatic ἐγώ and the ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν are important. The one anticipates Ἡρῴδης, and the other implies that they knew with what thoroughness the case had been investigated.[42] The section concludes with the familiar Lukan sentence: "Nothing worthy of death has been done by him." (οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου ἐστὶν πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ). This is parallel to 23:15,22: Acts 23:29; 25:25; 26:31. It is an often repeated verdict in the case of both sets of hearings.

(d) Luke 23:22

ὁ δὲ τρίτον εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς τί γὰρ κακὸν ἐποίησεν οὗτος; οὐδὲν αἴτιον θανάτου εὗρον ἐν αὐτῷ.

The phrase "nothing deserving death" (οὐδὲν αἴτιον θανάτου) is again the verdict recorded. The θανάτου is a qualification added by Pilate to his previous verdict of οὐδὲν αἴτιον without limitation (23:4, 15). It could be a sign of Pilate's weakening compromise or it could be a sign

---

[42]Cf. A. Plummer, The Gospel According to St. Luke (ICC), p. 524; J. M. Creed; The Gospel According to St. Luke, pp. 282-3.

of strong emphasis on Pilate's part. The former, however, seems more likely. Still the verdict is the same--innocent!

(e) There are five other less direct expressions of Jesus' "innocence" in this Gospel.

Luke 23:27-32

This is a puzzling passage which has given pause to exegetes for centuries. It should be remembered that it is unique to Luke as are all of the verses here discussed. Since it is, therefore, in the same category with the other materials which are all concerned with expressing Jesus' innocence, it seems probable that this passage too will have that meaning. Indeed, it does. Luke places a speech into Jesus' mouth as he is on his way to the cross in which he uses a familiar saying from tradition to proclaim his own innocence.[43] Bultmann believes that the entire story is a Lukan addition to the traditional Passion narrative and comes from material supplied by primitive Christian apologetic. He says "The form is old, because the saying in all probability goes back to an Aramaic form and because the scene has formal parallels in Jewish tradition."[44] While it is not possible to locate in tradition positive parallels to this specific saying, it is a motif

---

[43]R. Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition, p. 312.

[44]Ibid., p. 37.

common to early Christian literature.[45]

The probable meaning of this saying as it is placed into the mouth of Jesus by Luke is this: "Beware, for if One who is admittedly innocent (righteous) is treated as I am being treated, how will the guilty (unrighteous) be treated?" It is thus a Lukan "verdict" of Jesus' innocence combined with a warning in apocalyptic fashion.

Luke 23:34a

ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν πάτερ ἄφες αὐτοῖς
οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν.

Jesus' prayer upon the cross appears to be another peculiar Lukan expression of His innocence. However, there is a textual problem here which must be solved before any certainty concerning the passage can be ascertained. While the prayer appears in $\aleph^{*}$AC Koine pl latsy^{vg} (c)p Mcion Or, it does not appear in P^{75} BD* $\aleph^{a}$W θpc αϑsy^{s} sa.

This is one of those passages identified by Westcott-Hort as a "Western non-interpolation." This means that Jesus' prayer was not original to Luke, let alone actually uttered by Jesus (since it does not appear in any of the other Gospels either). Rather it was later added because the scribes of the Western tradition who were responsible either wanted to pardon the Romans for their part in the crucifixion (the "them" of Jesus' prayer being the Roman soldiers instead of the Jews) and attach all the

---

[45] Ibid., p. 37, n. 3.

blame upon the Jews, or they felt that the Lukan record was incomplete without the prayer, owing to the suggestive influence of Mt. 5:39 or 5:44.[46] That such harmonizing tendencies abounded in the early Christian centuries among the scribes is evident from such works as Tatian's Diatessaron.

If the foregoing is true, then this prayer of Jesus upon the cross may be dismissed from our present discussion because it contributed nothing to it and because our basic argument is not damaged by its omission. Indeed, it might be remarked that the scribes' addition of the prayer to the Lukan account is not contradictory to the other Lukan additions in that it also declares Jesus' innocence.

If, however, Epp[47] and others are correct in saying that this prayer was original to the text of Luke's Gospel and was later excised from the Western tradition because of an anti-Judaic polemic in the early Church, we are left with another expression of Jesus' innocence peculiar to Luke. Either way we look at it, we have in this prayer

---

[46]For a fuller discussion of the textual evidence for this passage see J. M. Creed, The Gospel According to St. Luke, pp. 286-7, who quotes the work of Harnack, Probleme im Texte der Leidensgeschichte Jesu, p. 255, and B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels, p. 138.

[47]E. J. Epp, Theological Tendency in Acts, p. 45, who quotes J. R. Harris, The Expositor, Series 8, 7 (1914), 333f., cf. 324f., 331ff.

from the cross another "Lukan" expression of Jesus' innocence, whether written by Luke himself or interpolated by later scribes in the "Lukan spirit."

Luke 23:30-43

This is an embellishment of Mk. 15:32 and Mt. 27:44 which merely note that those who were crucified with him reviled him. Here Luke goes on to stress once again the innocence of Jesus by placing these words into the mouth of one of the criminals: "This man has done nothing wrong" (οὗτος δὲ οὐδὲν ἄτοπον ἔπραξεν).

Luke 23:47

This is an alteration of Mk. 15:39 and Mt. 27:54 which say that the centurion exclaimed, "Truly this was a son of God" (ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν). Here Luke changes the expression to proclaim Jesus' innocence instead of His divinity: "Truly this man was innocent" (ὄντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν).[48]

Luke 23:48

This is the final addition by Luke. It again stresses the point of Jesus' innocence.

καὶ πάντες οἱ συμπαραγενόμενοι ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τὴν θεωρίαν ταύτην θεωρήσαντες τὰ γενόμενα τύπτοντες τὰ στήθη ὑπέστρεφον.

---

[48]A restriction of the meaning of δίκαιος results in the excellent sense "innocent." See G. D. Kilpatrick, JTS 42, 1941, pp. 34-6.

The multitude which was large owing to the Passover celebration, had viewed the whole tragedy as a "sight," spectaculum (v. 35), and now felt remorse for what had happened.

(C) Preliminary Conclusions Regarding the Literary Relationship

Between the Hearings of Paul in Acts and the Hearings of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke there is undoubtedly a close literary relationship. This relationship is not a casual one brought about by the fact that Luke was the author of both and therefore naturally, even unconsciously, expressed both in a similar manner. The use of identical phrases and words for accusation and verdict for both Jesus and Paul, and the record of the hearings before Herod unique to the Lukan writings indicate a conscious harmonizing of one account to the other. Furthermore, the fact that the Gospel materials which contain this close literary relationship to Acts are all peculiar to Luke and uninfluenced by either Mark or "Q" proves this relationship beyond doubt. However, the question of priority between the two Lukan records, that of the hearings of Paul in Acts and that of the hearings of Jesus in the third Gospel is impossible to answer on the basis of our inquiry at this point. We must be content to conclude that the evidence could go either way and that at least as far as the hearings section of Acts is concerned, Acts might as easily precede as

follow the gospel. Thus, our supposed terminus a quo disappears and the question of the occasion and purpose of Acts is left wide open to the suggestion made in these pages that Acts was actually written in about 62 A. D. by Luke while he was in Rome with his imprisoned friend and teacher, Paul, as an attempt to defend his teacher and Pauline Christianity. The parallelism which Luke draws between Paul's trial and Jesus' earlier trial is Luke's way of demonstrating the innocence of Paul and warning his readers that just as the Roman authority had executed an innocent Jesus, it was about to execute another innocent person--Paul.

PART IV

CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION

The occasion for the final drafting of Acts is approximately 62 A. D. when Luke was with Paul in Rome. However, the primary arguments for dating Acts have usually been based upon the evidence of the Prefaces of Luke and Acts, which seem to place the writing of Acts after the writing of the Third Gospel. The πρῶτον λόγον of Acts 1:1-2, generally identified as the Third Gospel, is not the Third Gospel as we now have it, but Proto-Luke as that document is identified by Streeter and others. A careful examination of the description of the πρῶτον λόγον as it is given in Acts 1:1-2, and a comparison of that with the Third Gospel, makes one aware of much additional material in Luke which does not fit into Acts' description. However, when Acts' description of the πρῶτον λόγον is compared with the known contents of Proto-Luke, it is seen to fit every detail where comparison is possible. Therefore, we conclude that the πρῶτον λόγον is Proto-Luke, not the Third Gospel as we now have it. Consequently, on the basis of this evidence, we assert the possibility that the Third Gospel

might have been written after Acts.

Beyond this, there are five arguments for the priority of Acts over Luke which appear to be unanswerable by those who continue to hold the opposite view. These are: (1) Acts shows no awareness of the seige of Jerusalem in 70 A. D. although the Third Gospel does; (2) Acts indicates no knowledge of the Neronian persecution of 64 A. D.; (3) Acts admits no dependence upon Josephus; (4) Acts indicates no knowledge of the disposition of Paul's trial in Rome; (5) Acts indicates no specific knowledge of Paul's letters.

Thus, while the arguments for the priority of the Third Gospel over Acts break down upon close examination, no other satisfactory reason has been given for Acts' failure to record these significant events in the history of the early church between 62-70 A. D. than that given in these pages: The reason Acts omits the significant events in the history of the early church between 62-70 A. D. is that they had not yet occurred when Acts was written. Therefore, we conclude that the occasion for the final drafting of Acts was approximately 62 A. D., while Luke was with Paul in Rome.

The purpose of Acts is basically a three-fold defense of Paul and Pauline Christianity. Acts is comprised mainly of three divisions and a conclusion: (1) The history of the church in Jerusalem under Peter--1:12-5:43; (2) The history of the expansion of the Gospel in "all

Judea and Samaria" through the "Hellenists"--6:1-12:24; (3) The expansion of the Gospel to "the end of the earth" through Paul--13:1-28:31. The author of Acts used divisions one and two, which had been written earlier, most probably by himself, as a pattern for writing division three. The parallelism is undeniable and the purpose of Acts 13:1-21:36 as based upon 1:12-5:43 is to defend the apostleship of Paul as being equal to that of Peter. The purpose of 13:1-21:36 as based upon 6:1-12:24 is to defend the Gentile mission of Paul.

The concluding section of Acts constitutes the trial of Paul--21:37-28:31. Here the author of Acts reaches into the oral or written record of Jesus' trial and uses for his pattern those elements of that record which appear only in the Third Gospel. Once one strips away the Markan and "Q" material within the Lukan record of Jesus' trial, it is easy to see the definite parallels between the two. Both sets of hearings are similar in number, addressee, and linguistic formulation of charges and verdicts.

It is not necessary to ask before what specific individual or group Luke is defending Paul and his Gospel. Luke is a devoted friend and follower of the apostle. He is sitting by helplessly while his beloved teacher is held prisoner and in danger of losing his very life. The only way Luke can help his friend is with his pen. Acts is Luke's desperate appeal for the famed "Roman justice" for Paul.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Arndt, W. F., and Gingrich, F. W. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, fourth revised edition, 1952.

Bruce, F. F. The Acts of the Apostles. London: Tyndale Press, second edition, 1952.

_____. The Book of Acts. Grand Rapids: W. B. Erdmans, 1954.

Bultmann, R. A History of the Synoptic Tradition. Translated by John Marsh. Oxford; Blackwell, 1963.

Cadbury, H. J. The Making of Luke-Acts. London: SPCK, 1961.

Charles, R. H. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Vol. II. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1964, first published in 1913.

Chase, F. H. Credibility of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles. London: Macmillan Co., 1902.

Conzelmann, H. Die Apostelgeschichte. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1963.

_____. The Theology of St. Luke. London: Faber & Faber, 1960.

Creed, J. M. The Gospel According to St. Luke. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1930.

Dibelius, M. A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature. London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1936.

_____. Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, translated by Mary Ling and edited by H. Greeven. London: SCM, 1956.

Dupont, J. The Sources of Acts. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964.

Epp, E. J. The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts. Cambridge: University Press, 1966.

Filson, F. V. The New Testament Against Its Environment. London: SCM, 1956.

_____. Three Crucial Decades. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1963.

Haenchen, E. Die Apostelgeschichte. Göttingen: Vandenhoech und Ruprecht, 1961.

Harnack, A. The Acts of the Apostles. Vol. 3. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1909.

Howard, P. E. The Book of Acts as a Source for the Study of the Life of Paul. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Southern California, June, 1959.

Jackson, F. J. Foakes. The Acts of the Apostles. London:

Hodder and Stoughton, 1931.

Koh, Roland. The Writings of St. Luke. Brief Notes on the Material Peculiar to the Writings of St. Luke and on the Possibility of the Acts of the Apostles Being Composed before the Third Gospel. Hongkong: Diocesan Literature Committee, 1953.

Lake, K., and H. J. Cadbury. The Beginnings of Christianity, K. Lake and F. J. Foakes-Jackson, editors. Vol. 4. Translation and Commentary. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1933.

Macgregor, G. H. C. The Acts of the Apostles, Vol. 9 in The Interpreter's Bible. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954.

Manson, T. W. The Sayings of Jesus. London: SCM Press, 1949.

Meyer, Eduard. Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums. 3 Bde. Stuttgart; Berlin: J. G. Cotta, 1921-3.

Moffatt, James. An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1918.

O'Neill, J. C. The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting. London: SPCK, 1961.

Rackham, R. B. The Acts of the Apostles. London, Methuen, 13th edition, 1947.

Ramsay, W. M. St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen. London: Macmillan, 1920.

Schneckenburger, Matthias. Über den Zweck der

Apostelgeschichte. Zugleich eine Ergänzung der neueren Commentare. Bern: Chr. Fischer, 1841.

Sherwin-White, A. N. Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament. Oxford: University Press, 1963.

Simon, Marcel. St. Stephen and the Hellenists in the Primitive Church. New York: Longmans, 1958.

Still, J. Ironside. St. Paul on Trial. A New Reading of the History in the Book of Acts and the Pauline Epistles. London: S.C.M., 1923. New York: George H. Doran, 1924.

Streeter, B. H. The Four Gospels. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1961.

Williams, C. S. C. A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1957.

Articles

Baur, F. C., "Über den Ursprung des Episcopats in der christlichen Kirche. Prüfung der neuestens von Hrn. D. Rothe hierüber aufgestellten Ansicht," TZT (1838), Drittes Heft, 1-185.

Bruce, F. F., "St. Paul in Rome," BJRL, 46 (1964), 326-345.

Buck, C. H., Jr., "The Early Order of the Pauline Corpus," JBL, 68 (1949), 351-57.

Cadbury, Henry J., "Acts and Eschatology," The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, eds., W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: University

Press, 1956, pp. 300-21.

_____, "Commentary on the Preface of Luke," in The Beginnings of Christianity, F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake, editors, Vol. 5, Additional Notes. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1933, pp. 489-510.

_____, "Roman Law and the Trial of Paul," in The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. 5, pp. 279-319.

_____, "The Appeal to Caesar," in The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. 5, pp. 312-319.

_____, "The Knowledge Claimed in Luke's Preface," Exp, Series 8, Vol. 24 (1922), 401-20.

_____. "The Purpose Expressed in Luke's Preface," Exp, Series 8, Vol. 21 (1921), 431-41.

_____, "The Speeches in Acts," in The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. 5, pp. 422-427.

Cullman, O., "Eschatology and Missions in the New Testament," trans. by Olive Wyon, The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, eds., W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: University Press, 1956, pp. 409-21.

_____, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity." JBL, 74 (1955), 213-26.

Dibelius, Martin, "Paul in the Acts of the Apostles," in Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, Mary Ling, translator, and Heinrich Greeven, editor. London:

SCM Press, 1956, pp. 207-214.

_____, "Style Criticism of the Book of Acts," in Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, pp. 1-25.

_____, "The First Christian Historian," in Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, pp. 123-137.

_____, "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography," in Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, pp. 138-191.

Dodd, C. H., "The Fall of Jerusalem and the 'Abomination of Desolation,'" JRS, 37 (1947), 46-54.

Dupont, Jacques, "Le Salut des Gentils et la Signification Théologique du Livre des Actes," NTS, 6 (1959-60), 132-55.

Easton, B. S., "The Purpose of Acts," in Early Christianity, F. C. Grant, editor. Greenwich, Conn.: Seabury Press, 1954, pp. 33-118.

Ehrhardt, A., "The Construction and Purpose of the Acts of the Apostles," StudTheol, 12 (1958), 45-79.

Emmet, C. W., "The Case for the Tradition," in The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. 2, pp. 265-297.

Enslin, Morton Scott, "A Notable Contribution to Acts," JBL, 52 (1933), 230-8.

Goodspeed, E. J., "Ephesians and the First Edition of Paul," JBL, 70 (1951), 285-91.

_____, "The Date of Acts," Exp, Series 8, Vol. 17 (1919), 387-91.

_____, "The Origin of Acts," JBL, 39 (1920), 83-101.

Heuthorst, G., "The Apologetic Aspect of Acts 2:1-13," Scripture, 9 (Apr., 1957), 33-43.

Johnstone, R., "Who Wrote the Acts, and What Were His Sources of Information?" Int, 8 (1911-12), 303-11.

Jones, Maurice, "Harnack on the Dates of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels," Exp, Series 8, Vol. 7 (1914), 193-212.

Krauss, C., "Kommt Lukas wirklich in der Apostelgeschichte vor?" Studien der evangelischen Geistlichkeit Würtembergs, 10 (1838, Heft 2), 122-47.

_____, "Ob Lucas der Verfasser der Apostel-Geschichte seyn könne? Antwort auf die Replik des Herrn Prof. Ulrich," Studien der evangelischen Geistlichkeit Würtembergs, 13 (1841, Heft 2), 106-40.

Lake, Kirsopp, "The Proconsulship of Festus," in The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. 5, pp. 464-467.

Menoud, Philippe H., "Le Plan des Actes des Apotres," NTS, 1 (1954), 44-51.

Meyer, Ben F., "The Initial Self-Understanding of the Church," CBQ, 27 (Jan., 1965), 35-42.

Parker, Pierson, "The 'Former Treatise' and the Date of Acts," JBL, 84 (1965), 52-58.

Perry, Alfred M., "Acts and the Roman Trial of Paul," HTR, 17 (1924), 195-96.

Piper, Otto A., "The Purpose of Luke," USR, 57 (1945-46), 15-25.

Plooij, D., "Again: The Work of St. Luke," Exp, Series 8, Vol. 13 (1917), 108-24.

_____, "The Work of St. Luke: A Historical Apology for Pauline Preaching Before the Roman Court," Exp, Series 8, Vol. 8 (1914), 511-23.

Reicke, B., "The Risen Lord and His Church. The Theology of Acts," Interpretation, 13 (1959), 156-59.

Riddle, Donald W., "The Occasion of Luke-Acts," JRel, 10 (1930), 545-561.

Robertson, A. T., "The Implications in Luke's Preface," ET, 35 (1923-24), 319-21.

Russell, Henry G., "Which Was Written First, Luke or Acts?" HTR, 48 (1955), 167-74.

Smith, R. H., "Eschatology of Acts and Contemporary Exegesis," CTN, 29 (1958), 641-663.

_____, "History and Eschatology in Luke-Acts," CTM, 29 (1958), 881-901.

Stagg, Frank, "The Purpose and Message of Acts," RE, 44 (1947), 3-21.

Still, J. I., "The Purpose and Plan of the Book of Acts," Exp, Series 8, Vol. 14 (1917), 194-205.

Unnik, W. C. van, "Luke-Acts, a Storm Center in Contemporary Scholarship," in Studies in Luke-Acts, Leander E. Keck and J. L. Martyn, eds. New York: Abingdon, 1966, pp. 15-32.

_____, "The Book of Acts--The Confirmation of the

Gospel," NovTest, 4 (1960), 26-59.

Williams, C. S. C., Review of The Acts of the Apostles by W. L. Knox (Cambridge: University Press, 1948) in JTS (1948), 204.

Windisch, H., "The Case Against the Tradition," in The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. 2, pp. 298-348.

Winn, A. C., "Elusive Mystery: The Purpose of Acts," Interpretation, 13 (1959), 144-156.

Zahn, Theodor, "Das dritte buch des Lukas," NKZ, 28 (1917), 373-95.

Zwaan, J. de, "Was the Book of Acts a Posthumous Edition?" HTR, 17 (1924), 95-153.